

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am in no sense antagonistic to the bill. I objected simply because there was no one here to explain it, and I knew nothing about it, and there were only a very few Senators on the floor. There will be an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. POMERENE. There is some one here to explain it now, so I hope the Senator will not insist on his objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think that to-morrow we can take up the calendar, and go over it again and go through it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., Monday, May 20, 1918) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 21, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 17), 1918.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CHIEF OF COAST ARTILLERY.

Brig. Gen. Frank W. Coe, National Army, to be Chief of Coast Artillery, with rank of major general, for a period of four years from May 24, 1918, vice Maj. Gen. Erasmus M. Weaver, to be retired from active service May 23, 1918.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Brig. Gen. John D. Barrette, National Army, to be brigadier general in the Regular Army from February 21, 1918, vice Brig. Gen. James Parker, retired from active service February 20, 1918.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Alfred T. Clay,
Robert C. Lee,
Leslie L. Jordan,
Lawrence F. Reifsnider,
Bolivar V. Meade,
George L. Weyler,
John F. Donelson,
Oliver L. Wolfard,
Thomas S. McCloy,
Lucien B. Green, 2d,
James H. Taylor, and
Frederick L. Riefkohl.

Boatswain John Evans to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 9th day of January, 1915.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy from the 15th day of February, 1918:

William Eberlin,
Thomas J. Bristol, and
William Taylor.

Pay Clerk Herbert H. Lowry to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1918.

Pay Clerk Lester A. Dyckman to be chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 16th day of March, 1918.

Lieut. Thomas E. Van Metre to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 24th day of April, 1918.

Ensign John Evans to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918.

Chief Boatswain John Evans to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1917.

Carpenter Frank A. Saar to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918.

Acting Pay Clerk Wiley B. Jones to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918.

The following-named temporary warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918:

Charles H. Phillips,
Claude Farmer,
Abraham M. Rosenberg,
Harry B. Luessen,
Eldridge L. Lineberry,
Harry A. Wentworth,
William F. Verleger,
Walter E. Hewitt,
Robert L. Bryan,

Gottlieb Grosch, and

Walter M. McCarthy.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918:

Ralph J. Pyatt,
Alfred E. Green,
Rodney B. Starr,
William Wakefield,
Thomas H. Esott,
Timothy Brown,
John C. Bauman, jr., and
Harley E. Barrows.

Ensign Francis S. Page, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918.

The following-named citizens to be acting chaplains in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 24th day of April, 1918:

Earl W. Foster, a citizen of Kentucky, and
Alfred de G. Vogler, a citizen of New York.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 17), 1918.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Col. Robert E. Noble to be brigadier general.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. William F. Stromeyer to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

John Rudolph Wikeen, and
Richard Carlton Hoblitzell.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

George M. Kemble, Alturas.
Stella L. Vincent, Carmel.

CONNECTICUT.

Louis E. Chaffee, Stafford Springs.

INDIANA.

Otto O. Griffin, Carthage.

IOWA.

Ida M. Truesdell, Ringsted.
Mae K. Honzelka, Van Horn.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Molly A. Gilman, Allerton.

MONTANA.

Victor N. Weber, Deer Lodge.
Rudolph P. Petersen, Rudyard.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Mal H. Jones, Rutherfordton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Lena L. Diehl, Dunn Center.

OHIO.

Edward F. Laner, Prospect.

TEXAS.

Hecton N. McKellar, Pecos.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 20, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John R. Carpenter, of Markesan, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we hallow Thy name, because Thou art Love.

We thank Thee for the light of another new day here upon earth. May we live this day aright. Whenever duty calls us, wilt Thou give us a clearer vision and the strength of character to accomplish that duty.

We thank Thee for our beloved Nation. Every day and every hour we pray for our success in everything that is true and right.

Bless the President of the United States and all who are holding responsible positions. Help us all in our various duties

in life, to do that which will result in the greatest good to the greatest number.

Be with those who are on battle fields far away. May Thy "everlasting arms" be about them, to protect, to defend, and to save, that they may be victorious in this great struggle for the betterment of mankind.

These and all blessings we ask in the name of Jesus our Savior. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 18, 1918, was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal as read will be approved.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the approval of the Journal, I wish to direct the Speaker's attention to the record of the proceedings as stated in the Journal, so far as the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is concerned, relating to the Senate amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill numbered 52. As the Journal states it, the motion was that the House agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment. The original motion, as borne out by the record of the proceedings, was to instruct the House conferees to insist on the following amendment, by striking out a certain part of it. This motion was limited to that certain part. If the Journal is approved as it is now recorded, the conferees on the part of the House will be barred entirely from entering upon the consideration in the conference of the rest of amendment numbered 52. I have in the last minute conferred with the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads [Mr. MOON], and he advises me that it was not his intention to agree to the Senate amendment numbered 52, but wished all the rest of the Senate amendment, other than that part which related to letter carriers, postal clerks, and railway mail clerks, to be in conference. The Speaker will remember that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] moved to disagree to all of the Senate amendments. That motion was agreed to. Then, after the House had voted to disagree to all of the Senate amendments, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] rose and moved to have the conferees instructed as to a certain portion of one of those amendments. It was within his province at that time to move to instruct; but it was not within the province of any Member of the House, after the House had by vote disagreed to all of the Senate amendments, to immediately move to agree to one of those amendments with an amendment. In order to get to the voting stage on all the amendments, back to that position where the House could vote to agree to any one of them, it would have been necessary to move a reconsideration. It was perfectly compatible with the House proceedings, after the House had disagreed to all the Senate amendments, for the gentleman from Illinois to move to instruct the conferees, but it was not within his province to move to agree to any of them with an amendment. I had made a point of order, but when I found from the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that his motion was not to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment but was a motion to instruct the conferees as to one of the amendments, I did not insist upon the point of order for that additional reason. I am making this suggestion so that the conferees will not be in a confused position when they get into conference. If the Journal stands as it is submitted to the House, when the conferees would get into conference the Senate conferees would say that the only question in conference, so far as Senate amendment No. 52 is concerned, is that part which relates to letter carriers, post-office clerks, and railway mail clerks; but I am assured by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] that he wants all the rest of the Senate amendment in conference, so that he can determine what should be the policy of the conferees and the policy of the House so far as voting \$200 per year increase to all of the postal employees other than letter carriers, postal clerks, and railway mail clerks. I would not at this time submit this matter to the attention of the House were it not that I have the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee that he wishes to have in conference all of the remaining part of amendment No. 52, the part other than that which relates to railway mail clerks, post-office clerks, and letter carriers.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the gentleman is aware that the gentleman from Illinois, who made this motion, stated that he wanted all of Senate amendment No. 52 retained except what he moved to strike out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not aware of that.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will refer to page 6743 of the Record he will find—

Mr. STAFFORD. What part?

Mr. WALSH. First column, toward the bottom of the column, where I said:

The gentleman refers to the Senate amendment No. 52?

Mr. MADDEN. That is it.

Mr. WALSH. There is part of that amendment which he desires retained, is there not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I want all retained except what I have just asked should be stricken out.

Now, of course it makes no difference whatever what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads may desire; it is the desire of the gentleman who offered the motion to strike out to instruct the conferees; and he made that motion upon suggestion from me incorporating the language that the conferees should be instructed to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment which is—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I remember distinctly, and the Record will show, that the gentleman from Illinois in the debate stated that he only wished to have the conferees instructed, so far as railway mail clerks, postal clerks, and letter carriers were concerned. He was not insisting on agreeing to the rest of the Senate amendment. In the debate during the pendency of the point of order, if he had stated that his motion was to agree to the Senate amendment 52 with an amendment, then I would have argued the question, and the Chair would necessarily have been obliged to hold that after the House had voted to disagree to all Senate amendments that it was then too late to move to concur in a Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman did make that point, but did not argue it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, what is the parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that the Speaker announced that without objection the Journal would be approved, whereupon the gentleman from Wisconsin reserved the right to object to agreeing to the Journal. Now he is expounding the reasons why he objected. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not correct that the Senate adopted the House bill except the amendment the gentleman from Illinois suggested to add to that amendment—

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not. The House bill contained no provision whatsoever for increase of the salaries of supervisory officials, and the Senate amendment is an entirely different proposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will read what the gentleman from Massachusetts said in this discussion. I read from page 6743. Here is what the gentleman said then:

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman refers to the Senate amendment No. 52?

Mr. MADDEN. That is it.

Mr. WALSH. There is part of that amendment which he desires retained, is there not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I want all retained except what I have just asked should be stricken out.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the gentleman desires to agree to the Senate amendment No. 52 with an amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to be certain of the retention of the classification feature of the bill H. R. 9414 as passed by the House.

Mr. WALSH. That should be the instruction.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to do whatever will accomplish the purpose.

Now, going through the Record there is no reference to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] other than the formal motion submitted by him and read by the Clerk. Now, on page 6742 this occurs:

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois in making his motion, I think, was in error in moving to instruct the conferees to strike out. It seems to me the proper thing is to move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to make a motion to instruct the conferees. What he may put in his instructions is another matter. What point does the gentleman from Massachusetts make?

Mr. WALSH. My suggestion was that the gentleman from Illinois moves to instruct the conferees to strike out of the bill certain language and insert other language. Of course, the bill is in conference. This is a House provision, and there is a Senate amendment. It seems to me that the motion for instruction should be to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is one way of getting at it.

Mr. MOON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken in this, that there is no House provision.

Mr. WALSH. Is there not a House provision to which was an amendment?

Mr. MOON. No; the gentleman is speaking of the provision that was in House bill 9414.

The SPEAKER. Where is the gentleman reading?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is in the beginning of the discussion immediately following the offering of the motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], first column, page 6742. The Speaker will remember that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

CANNON], before the motion was put, entered into discussion as to whether after a disagreement it was proper at the very beginning of the conference to instruct the conferees, so I think that it was the purpose of the House to move to instruct the conferees to insist on the Madden amendment to the Senate amendment No. 52 and disagree otherwise as to the entire amendment, and that the Journal should so state.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAFFORD. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the Speaker will allow me, I think I can clear this thing up. I think I stated in the discussion which took place that there was no difference between the House and the Senate in respect to rural carriers, laborers, chauffeurs, and other employees of the Post Office Department; that the only difference which existed was in the matter of clerks in first and second class offices, carriers in the City Delivery Service, and railway mail clerks.

And what I wanted to do—and whether I did it or not I do not know—was to provide instructions to the conferees to insist upon the retention of the classification provided in the bill H. R. 9414 in the consideration of the question in conference, leaving the other items inserted in the appropriation bill by the Senate open to such conference as might be thought proper.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman wished to have in disagreement between the two Houses the increase of salary allowance of supervisory officials and all other post-office officials which are carried in the Senate amendment, but which were not embodied in the original Moon-Madden bill?

Mr. MADDEN. What I wanted to do, I will say frankly, was to provide instructions to the conferees to insist upon the insertion of the provisions of the bill H. R. 9414 as those provisions related to clerks in first and second class offices, carriers in City Delivery Service, and railway mail clerks.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in response to a parliamentary inquiry on Saturday, propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], which inquiry was as follows:

Will this motion instruct the conferees to agree to the balance of amendment 52 except this language which is stricken out and with the insertion?—

The Speaker replied:

The Chair thinks so.

Now, that is found on page 6745, at the bottom of the left-hand column, when the debate had been about concluded. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] rose to ask as to the motion and as to its effect, and the Chair's understanding of it was in conformity with the understanding that prevailed during the colloquy and the discussion of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, namely, that all he wanted to do was to strike out certain language and insert the classification plan which had been approved by this House in a former bill, and in reply to a question by me he stated that he wished the rest of the Senate amendment 52 retained. And I submit that his motion to agree to Senate amendment 52 with an amendment was in effect a disagreement, and it was not in conflict with the previous action of the House by unanimous consent disagreeing to the Senate amendment. I submit that the Journal as read states the action taken by the House and sets forth the effect of it as understood by both the Speaker and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What does the Journal actually show in this connection?

The SPEAKER. The Journal shows this, that Mr. MADDEN moved that the conferees be instructed to agree to Senate amendment No. 52 with the following amendment, and then recites the amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I gathered the attitude of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], from his statement, it was to the effect that the House, having disagreed to the Senate amendments, it was therefore not competent for this body to instruct the conference committee to do a certain thing which, in substance, would amount to an agreement in part, of the matter in dispute.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman misunderstands my position. That is the very point I am arguing, namely, that the Journal should state just what the gentleman from Illinois attempted to do, which was to instruct the conferees as to matters relating to letter carriers, post-office clerks, and railway-mail clerks.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman's contention was that having in general disagreed, the House could not promptly turn around and agree?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, my contention is that the gentleman who moved to disagree to the amendment, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], wished to have a disagreement to that portion of the Senate amendment which related to supervisory officials, post-office inspectors, and everybody else, and also that which related to city letter carriers, post-office clerks, and railway-mail clerks.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say in this connection that the proposition that having disagreed to the Senate amendments, we are unable to instruct the conference committee to take any action which in substance would be an agreement pro tanto, can not be sound, for the following reason, that the instructions of the House to a conference committee are not the equivalent of an agreement by the House to the matter to which the instructions relate. I think the gentleman has in mind the principle that when the House inserts matter it can not turn about and strike out the same matter or strike out matter which it has inserted. But that principle does not apply for the reason given.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In spite of the instructions the conference committee may disagree to matter to which the instructions commit it to agree, and vice versa. Hence instructions to a committee to agree to an amendment can not be regarded as the formal agreement of the House to that amendment—and that being so, the logic of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] fails.

The SPEAKER. The situation was this, and the thing that attracted the attention of the Chair was that during a long service here he had never seen the matter transacted in the way the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] was trying to do. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made a suggestion, with which the Chair agreed, that the effect of the Madden motion was really to agree to the Senate amendment No. 52 with an amendment. And that has been done repeatedly; and the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is entirely correct. Now, even if the idea of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was correct that the House, having just disagreed to all these Senate amendments, could not do the thing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] was trying to do, he never made any such point in his argument, and it was rather an elaborate one, about the Madden motion, but he confined his objections to an entirely different thing. The Chair has read this thing over a half dozen times, and it seems to me that the effect of the Madden motion was simply to agree to Senate amendment No. 52 with an amendment which was embraced in his instructions. That is not an agreement to Senate amendment No. 52, and the Chair thinks that it has been journalized correctly. And the Journal as read will be adopted, without objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, we can not make a decision without a statement of the exact facts.

Now, there was at no time a motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to agree to the whole of Senate amendment No. 52 or to any part of it. The House had disagreed to the whole of it. Now, his proposition was not to agree to any part of it but to strike out a part of it, which, in effect, was an amendment to that extent only, and applicable to that part only—to strike out a certain part of it and insert other matter. It occurred to me that that does not have the legal effect of an agreement to the part of the matter that had been disagreed to heretofore, but simply applies to that particular portion of amendment No. 52 which Mr. Madden desired to correct by striking out and leaving the balance of the amendment disagreed to.

Inasmuch as there was no motion made at all to agree to any part of Senate amendment No. 52, it seems to me that the Journal of this House, in order to show the intent and purpose of the mover of that motion, and evidently the opinion of the House when it was passed, ought to show that the House insisted upon the amendment that Mr. MADDEN proposed, but maintained its disagreement as to the balance of Senate amendment No. 52.

It comes to us in a different shape from legislation usually. There was no provision in the original bill as it left the House on this question at all. It comes back now to us with an original Senate amendment. We disagreed to that amendment; want a certain portion of the amendment, or all of it, stricken out and new matter inserted. We expressed an opinion only as to a part of that amendment, which we desired removed and something substituted in its place.

Now, it occurs to me that the legal effect of that is not to affirmatively approve of the other part of that amendment. We

are taking action simply on the part referred to by Mr. MADDEN in his amendment, and we leave the balance of it disagreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, affirming the position of the gentleman from Tennessee, may I be privileged to read to the Speaker and to the House, in confirmation of that position, just what took place after all these matters heretofore referred to and before the vote was taken? In the discussion between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the gentleman from Tennessee made this statement, which will be found on page 6745 at the bottom of the second column. I read:

Mr. CANNON. The House would accede to the request of the Senate and agree to the conference. That would be the ordinary course of procedure. Of course, the House might at any time instruct its conferees. What was the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. MOON. As I understand the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], it was to amend the Senate amendment by inserting the provisions on this question that was passed in H. R. 9414, the legislative bill on that proposition, which is a change of the existing law on the subject of classification.

Mr. CANNON. That would be perfectly proper, the Senate having proposed the legislation, to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is that the motion?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Then, it does not involve any instructions at all. Of course, you could instruct, but ordinarily it is not done. Later on, if the House was willing—

Mr. MOON. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that simply to agree to a Senate amendment with an amendment, without stating what that amendment was, would give no information to the conferees.

Mr. CANNON. You propose to put in that amendment?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. When that goes in, that is all the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks for.

Mr. CANNON. It is the difference between agreeing with an amendment and instructing the conferees. I think the House has very rarely instructed its conferees in the first instance. I suppose it has the power to do it, but it is out of the ordinary course, and would not amount to anything more than to pursue the ordinary course, in my judgment, in the event that the Senate would not agree.

Now, here is the potential part of this discussion:

Mr. MOON. I think the idea probably was that it carries with it a suggestion from the House as to what the legislation ought to be on a subject on which the House has not legislated in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. But you can do that by concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. MOON. I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, the House has already disagreed to the Senate amendments.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. MOON. This is a motion, after a disagreement to the Senate amendments, to instruct the conferees as to what action they shall take as to this particular amendment.

That is the last expression of the gentleman as to what he wished on this subject.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman from Tennessee was not making the motion. I suggest that.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to state that it certainly was not my intention to accept the Senate provisions of the salary legislation with an amendment. My sole intention was to strike out certain language in that part of the Senate amendment which provided for a \$200 per annum increase in the compensation of the clerks in first and second class offices, the carriers in City Delivery Service, and the railway mail clerks, and to substitute for the language stricken out the language pertaining to that particular phase of the salary legislation embodied in the classification features of House bill 9414.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What did the gentleman mean, then, when he stated, in reply to a question, that he wanted Senate amendment 52 retained except what he had just asked to be stricken out?

Mr. MADDEN. What I mean was that I had personally no objection to language employed by the Senate as to the other features of the legislation, but I seriously objected to the language employed by the Senate as to that feature of the legislation which dealt with the clerks and carriers and railway mail clerks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the easiest way to settle this matter is to defer the adoption of Saturday's Journal, and let the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] retire to some quiet place and see if they can put that proposition in such shape that it will not get the House conferees into a tangle over in the Senate. I will ask that that be done. The Clerk will read Sunday's Journal.

The Journal of the proceeding of Sunday, May 19, 1918, was read and approved.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM A. JONES.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, some days since the House agreed to have the memorial exercises in relation to the late Representative JONES on next Sunday, May 26. Owing to the inability of several Members to participate in these exercises on this date and awaiting the memorial proceedings, official and semiofficial, from the Philippine Islands, I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated. Subsequently I will ask that another date be fixed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to vacate the order for memorial services on May 26 for the late Representative JONES of Virginia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. JAMES] at a patriotic meeting on April 21 last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting a speech made by his colleague [Mr. JAMES] on a patriotic subject. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOLDIERS' VOTE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. On what subject?

Mr. ROGERS. I want to refer again to the matter of the soldiers voting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to address the House for three minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I think the House and the country have been a good deal mystified by the divergent and irreconcilable reports issued from the various branches of the War Department with reference to the policy to be pursued this fall by the War Department on the subject of the soldiers voting in France.

In the first place, the Acting Secretary of War gave to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts last month, while Secretary Baker was still in Europe, a long written opinion in which it was laid down as a positive rule that the taking of the soldiers' votes in France would not be tolerated by the department. In letters signed by The Adjutant General, addressed to me and to one of the Senators, which I printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few days ago, practically the same thing was stated. Since then Mr. Baker has returned from France where, presumably, he looked into the whole matter and considered the feasibility of taking the overseas soldiers' votes. He has within a few hours given out a statement concerning the matter, which I think will be of interest to the House and which I ask to have read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

MAY 18, 1918.

The question of having the soldiers vote is a difficult one, but everybody is anxious to have it done if possible.

You know with the soldiers in this country we made a rule that wherever a State had provided the machinery for taking the vote of the soldiers we would help all we could to facilitate the operation of that machinery. The War Department obviously can not take the responsibility of taking, collecting, and returning the votes. If it is possible for us to work out a plan by which we can facilitate the States doing it through their own agencies, agencies of their own creation, we would be very happy to do it.

If States provide machinery which is practicable and can be worked we will do our utmost to enable them to work it. If some plans are practicable and some impracticable we will not punish those who are practicable because of the impracticability of others.

If it is possible to work out a plan it will apply to the American Expeditionary Force.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to express an opinion, I think the statement represents precisely the view which the War Department ought properly to adopt and which it apparently has now definitely decided to adopt. In the first place, military considerations must come first. In the second place, subject only to these military considerations, everything will be done to permit the soldiers in France to vote this fall. The statement makes it clear—what must be clear under the Constitution—that it is up to the States themselves; but that the War Department will cooperate in every way with the States in order to make possible the voting in France. Six or eight, possibly ten States have already submitted plans for soldiers voting in France. Massachusetts is one that has been working very hard on the question; Mississippi is another, as the

gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] discussed fully the other day; others are North Carolina, New Jersey, Connecticut, Kansas, and Nebraska. The War Department officials have told me this morning that they regard the Mississippi plan as entirely practicable, because it does not overburden the War Department officials in this country or in France. So it is squarely before the several States to decide what to do on this important matter. It rests with each to determine whether or not its over-seas citizen soldiers shall be disfranchised.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CONTRIBUTION BY NATIONAL BANKS TO THE RED CROSS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that it might be well for Members to understand that there is a special order for 5 o'clock this afternoon. There was a special order made Saturday whereby the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would be recognized to move a suspension of the rules for the purpose of passing a bill authorizing national banks to contribute to the Red Cross.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of a bill which I introduced to-day to punish those who are guilty of mob violence in attempting to execute the laws of the United States. I want to have the short bill printed with some remarks of my own.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it simply a bill which the gentleman wants to print?

Mr. MASON. A short bill, and my remarks in support of it, which bill goes to the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record and to incorporate the bill in his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. Frequently within the last two weeks, and perhaps longer, there have been reports in the form of speeches of what has been said in the Senate by Senators, always complimentary, nothing critical except in a friendly way, as to the value or merit of a particular bill. My inquiry is whether it is in order for a Member to quote anything, favorable or unfavorable, that a Senator has said on the floor of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. It is not. It is liable to provoke crimination and recrimination on the floor of the House, and also to get up crimination and recrimination between the House and the Senate.

FOOD PRODUCTION.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill H. R. 11945, relating to food production, and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] has 37 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in respect to the time yet at the disposal of the gentleman from Iowa, on Saturday afternoon the gentleman from Mississippi asked how the time stood, and the Chair replied at that time that the gentleman from Iowa had still 67 minutes at his disposal. In the absence of the gentleman from Iowa, I yielded 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] and later extended his time two minutes. I then yielded five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and that was all the time used on this side out of the 67 minutes, with the exception of one minute by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD]. That makes 18 minutes of time that was consumed out of the 67 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, is merely stating what the memorandum of the Clerk shows. He has two other items of time which the gentleman from Michigan has not referred to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] was yielded 10 minutes and 1 minute, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was yielded 5 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota 1 minute. If they consumed more time, it was up to the Chair, and it should not be taken out of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course not. The gentleman will get all the time he is entitled to. If the Chair's recollection is of any value, it is that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] had 2 minutes yielded him in addition to the 10.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think the gentleman asked for two and I yielded one.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, according to the gentleman's statement there is a difference of only 2 minutes, and according to him he is entitled to 50 minutes. Why not make it 50 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what it will be. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to 50 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi to 37 minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of being extended this privilege on this first Red Cross day, and I will show my appreciation by being as brief as I can. Let me say that the Red Cross bill that is coming up later to-day for the amendment of the national-banking act is a war measure and is a very important bill. Its purpose is to permit national banks to contribute to the Red Cross. I thought at one time that by consent of all of the stockholders of a bank it might make contributions to the Red Cross for war purposes, but something more is required. The depositors are interested in the security and management of the bank. We can not under the law by action of the board of directors or even with the consent of the stockholders themselves contribute this money. There is one other suggestion I wish to make in reference to that bill, and that is I hope there will be an amendment offered to it by which national banks may be permitted to contribute to the war Y. M. C. A., which is a counterpart, a running mate with the Red Cross.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If national banks, through directors not representing in many instances much stock, can contribute, what is to become of State banks that have gone into the Federal Reserve System? They are not authorized to contribute, and have we authority to authorize them to contribute? Have we authority to take the small holders who happen to be directors and permit them to dispose of the property of the big holders, or have we the right to permit the big holders to dispose of the property of the small holders, and then after that is done have a drive upon them as citizens in their particular localities to contribute to the Red Cross? Take the New York banks, for example. Their stock is distributed all over the country. The directors contribute personally. If you have any New York bank stock, do you want them to dispose of your property?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that the rule under which we are operating confines the discussion to the bill. I did not want to interrupt, but I have been advised that if I permit anyone to depart from the rule that a point of no quorum will be made and I shall be compelled to wait 45 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Permit me to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] by saying that Congress has nothing to do with State banks. In reference to this bill, it is an act to provide further for the national security and defense by promoting agriculture and by stimulating the distribution of agricultural products. And, it being a war measure, and all our legislation and the life and very existence of our Nation being at stake, makes the welfare of our Army and Navy always in order, and especially the Red Cross.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order with reference to the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think I am in order when talking about the national security and the national defense which is contained in the title of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be permitted to discuss the bill to which he has referred, the Red Cross bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that his colleague may be permitted to discuss the Red Cross bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Red Cross bill will come up later in the day. This bill was brought up under a special rule as to debate on the merits of this measure. Now, I have no objection, of course, to the gentleman discussing the Red Cross bill at the proper time, but if it is injected into the discussion

upon this bill some of us gentlemen who are waiting to be advised of the merits of this proposition will not be advised. I do not think we ought to try to discuss the two measures under a special rule confining debate to one measure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not think there will be any opportunity of saying anything on the Red Cross bill when it comes up to-day, and I only want now to say that I think it is an important bill and ought to be allowed, but amended. That is all I care to say as to that.

If I may now be permitted, I wish to say something about food and fuel. Fuel is just as important to win the war as food, and it is just as bad to freeze to death as to starve to death. There is not much difference. A part of this money is to be used in the production of coal, or can be so used. We are told that mining coal is a mere matter of transportation. Dr. Garfield says that. Trains can be run almost continually upon all of the railroads. We have the trackage. It is a matter of trains, of hiring of men to dig the coal, putting it on the cars, and transportation. It is a question of having the coal mined, the cars, the engines, and the men to run them. It is a matter of cost, a matter of price. And we ought to begin to-day to get coal for next winter. We are advised that now is the time to order our coal. But when we order it we can not get it. A gentleman told me Saturday he had ordered his coal two months ago and he has not got it yet. He is told that the coal yard has not the coal. Coal dealers should fill up their coal yards and do it now.

I wish to speak about the food provisions of the bill. We were told when we were discussing the Agricultural bill a short time ago that the minimum price of wheat should be fixed at \$2.20 a bushel.

The farmers are all urged now to raise more wheat. They are offered the inducement of \$2.20 per bushel. Whether this is sufficient or not remains a question. The farmers are patriotic, and I am sure they would raise the wheat at a loss if necessary in order to support our armies and to feed our people during war time. From the list of States following there can not be much profit to the farmer in raising wheat at \$2.20 per bushel. These figures are taken from the Agricultural Yearbook, prepared by the Agricultural Department of the Government for the year 1916, on page 575:

Yield of wheat crop, 1916.

	Bushels per acre.
Indiana	12
Illinois	11
Minnesota	7.4
Missouri	8.5
North Dakota	5.5
South Dakota	6.8
Kansas	12
Kentucky	9
North Carolina	10.5
South Carolina	10.6
Georgia	11.4
Tennessee	9.2
Alabama	9.5
Texas	11
Oklahoma	9.7
Arkansas	8
Average	10.13
Delaware	15
Virginia	12.5
West Virginia	14.5
Ohio	13.5
Iowa	15.8
Mississippi	15
Kansas	11
Average	13.9

Average yield per acre for whole United States.

[From Agricultural Yearbook, 1916, p. 67.]

1866 to 1875	11.9
1907 to 1916	14.7

The following I take as a fair average cost of raising an acre of wheat in Michigan. Of course, the cost will be slightly less than these figures where the soil is light and sandy or a tractor can be used. It will cost slightly more where the ground is rough or heavy and where a walking plow is used:

Cost per acre to produce wheat.

Plowing	\$3.00
Rolling	1.00
Dragging	1.50
Fertilizer	3.00
Seed	4.00
Twine and cutting	2.00
Drawing in and stacking	1.00
Thrashing and help	2.00
Marketing	1.00
Interest on land and tools	5.00

Making a total cost of \$24 per acre.

In making this estimate I might add that some seed wheat in the fall of 1917 cost as high as \$3.80 per bushel and rye as high as \$3 per bushel, while the price of fertilizer is estimated at \$30 a ton.

There was only one State in the United States—Arizona—that produced an average yield of 29 bushels per acre, and that State raised only 1,600,000 bushels. The next highest yield was by Nevada, being 28.9 bushels, which raised only 1,593,000 bushels. Maine raised next highest, average yield of 27 bushels, which raised only 135,000 bushels.

All the other States were below those figures, and the total average for the United States in 1916 was only 12.1 bushels.

The yield for the year of 1917 I have not at hand, but it was slightly more than for the year 1916.

The estimate for the present year, 1918, in Michigan is around 57 per cent of an average crop, which may be increased by fair weather and conditions.

The estimate of the Agricultural Department for the whole United States for the year 1918 is 572,539,000 bushels of winter wheat, which, together with the planting of spring wheat, may bring the yield of both winter and spring wheat up to the 1,000,000,000-bushel mark. If so, this will be a bumper wheat crop for America. I included nothing in the above cost per acre for the wear and tear or use of tools.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the total?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The total cost is \$24 an acre.

Now, as to live stock, it takes a bushel of corn to put 5 pounds of meat on a grade steer. It will put 8 pounds on a hog and produce 5 pounds of mutton fed to a sheep or lamb. Corn costs \$1.25 to \$1.50 a bushel. Divide the cost of a bushel of corn by 5 and you get what it costs the farmer to fatten sheep and cattle. Talk about price fixing! I say the price of wheat should have been fixed at \$2.50 a bushel, and I do not know how the President fixed it at \$2.20. I do not know how the House fixes it at \$2.20. I can see how the Senate fixed it at \$2.50. The farmer is entitled to what it costs him and a fair, reasonable profit for his labor. Some have stated that \$2.50 would make flour cost \$18 a barrel and increase the cost of bread. Bread to-day costs the consumer practically the same price with wheat at \$2.20 per bushel as it did in May, 1917, when wheat sold at \$3.40 a bushel. I leave it to any man in the House if it is not as high to-day, or higher, with wheat at \$2.20 than it was a year ago when wheat was \$3.40 a bushel on the Chicago and St. Louis markets.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman seen any bread with wheat in it in the last six months?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I hope not.

Mr. PLATT. I have not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The American people ought not to eat a loaf of bread until we lick the king of tyranny, the lord of barbarity, the outrager of virtue, and the murderer of innocent women and children. Think of a command to murder four children out of a family of five, so that the mother would advocate, beg, and pray for peace! Talk about peace now, as I have seen in some speeches made—

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will.

Mr. REED. Is it not a fact that the administration claims that is the minimum price of wheat, that there is no maximum price?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The minimum price in this case is the maximum; it is the same thing. I have heard—it was stated here by some Member; I do not remember who it was—that if wheat was \$2.50 a bushel, flour would be \$18 a barrel. It takes 4½ bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour in an up-to-date mill, and any mill can make a barrel of flour out of 5 bushels of wheat. There is not a mill in the United States but what will be glad to grind those 5 bushels for the middlings and the by-products, in which case the barrel of flour would cost \$12.50 with wheat at \$2.50 a bushel.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know whether the farmers had any representative on the board or committee that assisted in arriving at the minimum price for wheat?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not know of any, and I looked to see who was on that committee, but could not find it; but, anyhow, whether they were on or whether they were off—

Mr. WALSH. I was informed they had no representative.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would think that they had not.

Gentlemen, we want and must have wheat, and now is the time to prepare for putting in the fall crop of 1918. Planting time is only a little more than 90 days off.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I want to say that there were farmers on the committee that fixed the price at \$2.20.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They did not fix it high enough, according to the record.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There were farmers on that board, but their wishes were utterly ignored in the matter of fixing the price of wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield further time to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am pleased to have the statement of my colleague [Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan], and I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE] for yielding me more time.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will.

Mr. FESS. We hear it constantly stated that the price was the minimum. Is it not true that if the Government becomes the buyer of an article that there is no competition later and the minimum price must be the maximum?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am very glad the gentleman asked me that question. That is a well-established fact. The Government now buys wool. No one else is buying wool. The price was fixed at the same price for which it sold on the 25th of April, 1917, but it is only purchased on Government account and when the Government wants it. If the farmer tried to sell his beans, the local buyers were not taking in beans, and also they were not buying hay, because they could not get the cars to load it in.

So I say these things about farming. I will put the figures in the Record. I shall approximate them, because some lands work easier than other lands and you can put in a crop for less. But I am talking about my own State, which is surely an average State for agriculture. And I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that I think he is right in that the minimum price is the maximum price, when the Government fixes it, in all things.

Mr. FESS. Whenever the Government becomes the purchaser of an article the maximum will be in unison with the minimum.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

And I am glad to see that this bill is reported as a war measure, because we can not whip Germany unless we have food. That is plain enough. Some put the limitation of an army at 5,000,000, some say 8,000,000, and some say we should remove the lid. I want to tell you now what I think about that. We are fighting the whole German nation. We are fighting 75,000,000 people, and I do not know whether or not we have fully comprehended it. But whether our Army is 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or 5,000,000 men, every one of us here at home should do all we can to aid and support the Army and raise all the food we can to supply food and munitions to win this war. Until it is won we should not talk peace. We should talk about war.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In just a second. We should talk about war because we are engaged in it, and there can be no lasting peace without victory. When you see the peace cards put down on the table, look and see whether or not Belgium is to be restored; whether or not bleeding France is to be indemnified; and, above all, whether or not there is going to be any more wars and that there will be a lasting peace. We are fighting now for the welfare, safety, and the very existence of our Nation.

Mr. McKENZIE. I take it the gentleman has studied this bill, and although I do not suppose he will have time enough, if he does I would like to have him point out to me just any one way that this bill that we are now discussing will increase the output of the farms for this year and help us win this war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will be very glad to do that right now. I have read the bill quite carefully, also the report, and would say that in September, 1918, we will put out our wheat crop. In Michigan the average wheat crop this year is estimated at about 9 bushels an acre, according to the reports; and it will take \$24 an acre, my friends, to put that wheat out, harvest it, and put it on the market. If you can see how a man can get his money back when receiving \$2.05 a bushel—and that is what the farmer gets, although they talk \$2.20—I would like to know it. Of course the miller pays more; possibly \$2.50. But now is the time to prepare for the next year's crop. The Thirty Years' War, the Napoleonic War of 10 years duration, and the Seven Years' War were all long ones. Let us prepare for a long, hard war; then if the end comes sooner we will all rejoice, but if not we will be ready to do our best. We will be fighting next year; we will be fighting, maybe, for 10 years. The Seven Years' War was successfully fought by Prussia with a population of 5,000,000 against an allied population of 100,000,000. We are a nation of 100,000,000 people and with our allies we are going to win this war. I am for coordinating every allied nation; I am for getting all the nations who have declared war against Germany together now. Let us get in all we can of South America as we have all of North America. Let us go down and see if we can not get Mexico in some way to come in.

Let us take in Japan, let us take in China, and every South American Republic, and let us lick Germany decisively and have no more wars. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this measure, as I have supported every measure that appeared to me to be for the best interest of the Nation and that would help to further the interest of our country in this great conflict in which we are now engaged.

My colleague, Mr. CANDLER, has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for a number of years. Knowing how great an interest he always displays in regard to everything affecting the agricultural interests of the country, and having seen such frequent evidence of the wide information on such subjects, and having such confidence in his judgment and integrity, I would feel justified in supporting this bill simply because it is reported by him and has his indorsement.

Having read the bill and given it some thought, my conclusion is that we should follow his lead on this matter and give it hearty support.

This is an act "to promote further the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products."

As I recall the debate, there have been only two or three criticisms of the measure. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] had a lot to say about the form of the bill. He says there are duplications, that many of the items in this bill are covered by similar items in the regular Agricultural appropriation bill.

That is true. But that is not a proper subject for criticism. Where the same item appears in both bills it is not provided twice for the same work. It is an extension of the work. It is no criticism of the committee to say that it did not make as full provision on many subjects in the regular bill as is proposed now. We are living now in abnormal times. New conditions are confronting us. Each rising sun brings with it new problems. Our vision is broadening. We realize that there must be expansion and extension along a great many lines, and it is the effort and intention of the committee in bringing out this bill to meet conditions as they exist at present and to anticipate the future as best it may.

Mr. QUIN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. QUIN. Six of the vital provisions of this measure, which are supplemental to the other bill, are worth more than any other legislation that Congress ever brought up, are they not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I agree that they are all matters of great importance even in normal times, and I believe that they may well be considered as matters of almost vital importance in the present circumstances.

Mr. QUIN. The Market Bureau has a large sum provided for, and there is a live-stock provision that is very valuable.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. All those items are very important and very necessary. The Bureau of Markets, to which the gentleman refers, is exceedingly important. The distribution of agricultural products is a matter of great moment, both to the producer and the consumer.

Mr. QUIN. All the great American food products are cared for in this measure, are they not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Yes. I desire to commend the committee for being able to so thoroughly grasp the situation and to discern the present condition of the country in this regard.

As I was saying when interrupted, the gentleman from Iowa criticized the form of the bill. It is not "form" but substance in which we should be interested. We should inquire: Does it meet the conditions? Will it help to advance the interests of the Nation in this conflict? Will it stimulate agriculture as it is designed to do? Will it facilitate the distribution of agricultural products? Is the legislation necessary for the prosecution of the war?

If these questions are answered in the affirmative, then there should be no quibbling about matters of form.

All realize, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] stated a moment ago, that the production of food is a very important and necessary work at this time. A great army of men, a strong naval force, large guns, an immense fleet of aircraft, and all those things that go to make up a fighting force will avail nothing unless there is a supply of foodstuff.

Mr. QUIN. I know how ardent a friend the gentleman has always been in behalf of the farmers. It will aid the farmers, too, will it not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Indeed it will. There is no question about that.

Some gentlemen criticized the committee because the bill simply appropriated lump sums. Why, gentlemen, should we stop to quibble over a little matter of that kind? We have practically placed the entire power of the Nation into the hands of one man. We have said: "Here are the resources of the country, take them and use them as you deem best." Time after time, since the war began, we have appropriated many millions of money in lump sums to the various departments.

In this time of crisis it is proper to do this. We trust the honor, the integrity, and the judgment not only of the President but of the various men at the head of these great departments. The right to exercise their discretion in many matters should not be hampered. We have granted this right frequently, and there is no good reason for refusing it to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will undoubtedly expend this money in an effort to stimulate agriculture, help the farmer, and benefit the entire Nation.

This is a war measure. My friends, we are all of one mind, I am sure. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] said in this House only a few days ago:

Mr. Speaker, there were differences among us in the beginning of this war. But there is one proposition about which there is no division in this Chamber. Germany may as well understand that America will never submit to a peace dictated by Berlin. Americans know now, if they have not realized heretofore, that free America can not survive if Germany wins. I do not believe that there is a man in this Chamber who would hesitate to give all he has if it shall become necessary to give all in order to win.

He was stating the truth when he credited the membership with patriotic impulses and an earnest desire to see victory crown our efforts in this conflict. [Applause.]

There have been, of course, differences of opinion as to methods of procedure—some have preferred one plan and some another—but on the one great question of winning the war there has been no disagreement. The success of our country, the preservation of our institutions, the honor of our flag, are of interest to all alike, and all have been prompted to action by those things.

Because a man differs from me as to how to win the war does not mean that he is any less patriotic than I am or any more so. Dr. Frank Crane, a noted American writer, recently said:

Be patriotic but not hysterical. Don't accuse all who do not agree with you of being pro-German.

He is right. This is not a time for hysteria. What we want is cool, steady, earnest action. We are opposed by a cruel, determined enemy. All our intellect and energy must be used to the very best advantage. Nothing should be allowed to weaken the full force of our powers. We should hit hard and direct our blows well, so that they may have the desired effect.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt now—indeed, I have never doubted—the loyalty and patriotism of the American people. Naturally there was deep sorrow and regret that war came upon us. On April 2, 1917, when President Wilson addressed Congress in regard to a declaration of war, his countenance was grave, his appearance indicated how deeply he regretted that war should come to the Nation, and he said that he was performing "a distressing and oppressive duty."

To suffer physically and mentally; to sacrifice fond desires and cherished ambitions; to endure hardships and privation is, to use the language of the President, "a distressing and oppressive duty," but it is a duty and one that will be performed well and nobly by our people.

There is too much at stake to do otherwise. That we shall become the serfs of German government, to be ruled by the Kaiser, is too horrible a thought to be indulged in. Better, far better, to be blotted out as a race and a Nation and become only a name and a memory in the history of the world.

"Woe to the conquered" has always been the motto of the Prussian. Rapine, murder, and pillage blacken the annals of every campaign. Bloodthirstiness and lust and a mania for destruction are Prussian characteristics. They have written a record of infamy that can never be blotted out. Every humane heart in the wide world has been made to bleed by their atrocities and barbarism.

In the public forum, the pulpit, and the schoolroom the most pernicious, the foulest, doctrines have been announced. The people of that country have been taught most horrible precepts. They have been taught the "law of the jungle," of the lion and the tiger and the wolf; that might makes right; that war alone can bring true honor and glory; that "man is stunted by peaceful days"; that the Germans are the chosen people of God and that nothing, no matter how frightful or hideous or ghastly, should prevent them from overrunning the entire world.

One of them said:

Ye have heard men say, "Blessed are the peacemakers"; but I say unto you, "Blessed are the war makers," for they shall be called, if not the children of Jahve, the children of Odin, who is greater than Jahve.

Neitzsche, one of their greatest writers, said:

Life is essentially the appropriation, the injury, the subduing of the alien and weak. It is suppression, compulsion, the enforcing of its own forms. It is assimilation and, at the least and gentlest, exploitation.

The weak and crippled should go to the wall; that is the first principle of our philanthropy.

Do I counsel you to love your neighbor? Nay, I counsel you rather to shun your neighbor and to love those farthest away.

This great teacher of his people said, in discussing the doctrine of Jesus Christ enjoining brotherly love:

Believe me, my brethren, He died too early; He himself would have revoked His doctrine had He reached mine age—about 38 years.

They have been taught to harden themselves, so far as other people are concerned, against feelings of brotherhood, of compassion, of mercy and charity, and that war is necessary and normal, and that peace is a disease that insidiously saps the life of a nation, robbing it of honor, strength, and beauty.

They look upon the whole world as theirs to take if they desire it. Less than one year ago one of their statesmen said:

The whole history of the world is neither more nor less than a preparation for the time when it shall please God to allow the affairs of the universe to be in German hands.

Bismarck contemptuously referred to the United States as "a big, fat hog that we will stick some day." Germany has always objected to the Monroe doctrine and has felt aggrieved at us for it. During the Spanish-American War the Kaiser expressed himself as regretting that his Navy was not large enough to enable him to "take the United States by the scruff of the neck."

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to multiply citations to prove the character of our enemy nor to show his feeling toward and his designs upon us. Hundreds of instances might be given.

We have been taught to love peace and abhor war. We regret deeply that our Nation is at war; but being in it, there is only one thing to do—give a good account of ourselves in it, with a firm and steady purpose that never while there is a man left to fight nor a dollar left to spend shall this cruel, barbarous enemy be able to say that our Nation has been conquered.

My sympathies from the very beginning of this war have been with the allies. The invasion of Belgium, the raping of women, the mutilation of children, the murder of old men, the horrible orgy of frightfulness inaugurated in the very beginning of the war prevented me from having the slightest feeling of sympathy with Germany.

Of course, since our entrance into the war every true American citizen, no matter on what side his sympathies may have been prior to that time, is wholeheartedly on the side of his country now. Every time the true American sees the Nation's flag he sees not merely a piece of cloth waving in the breeze, but he sees behind it his family and friends, his country's honor, and all that country can mean to a patriotic, liberty-loving man.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a tribute to the flag that is worthy of a place in the RECORD:

A TOAST TO THE FLAG.

Here's to the Red of it—
There's not a thread of it,
No; nor a shred of it,
In all the spread of it,
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing it red.

Here's to the White of it—
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's prayer for it
Kept it so white.

Here's to the Blue of it—
Heavenly view of it,
Star-spangled hue of it,
Honesty's hue of it,
Constant and true.
Here's to the whole of it,
Stars, stripes, and pole of it;
Here's to the soul of it—
Red, White, and Blue.

—New Britain (Conn.) Herald.

In defense of that flag which symbolizes to us all life and liberty, home and country, honor and civilization, we will defend ourselves. Every true man will do his duty. All the responsibility does not rest upon the soldiers. Those in civil life must do their part. Not only must they pay taxes, buy

bonds, subscribe to the Red Cross, but each one, man, woman, and child, has the duty of extending his cooperation toward putting in force the full power of the United States in its fight against Germany.

Let us do all the work that we can; let us pray that peace may come; let us make peace come by using every energy, every power, every resource in the Nation that will contribute to bring us victory. The war will be won. The greater the effort we put forth now, the sooner will be the end. Let us hasten the day of peace and victory by giving everything that is needed now. And let us hope that, at the end of this war, there shall come a more perfect peace, a firmer happiness, and a more splendid civilization than the world, in all its history, has ever known. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON of Virginia). The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am in favor of this bill, although I voted against the adoption of the rule to bring it in, believing that three hours' time was not sufficient to enable the Members to discuss it.

I desire to make a few observations relative to the Food Administrator and some of the rules and regulations the people of the country are now subject to. These observations are made with a spirit of friendliness toward our Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover, and I hope some good may result therefrom. I understand that at the present time the people of this country are consuming but 35 per cent of our normal consumption of wheat flour, and I do not hesitate to submit the opinion that without regulations wheat flour would be selling to-day at three times its present price, and I know that the people of this country are ready to sacrifice and are willing to assist in the saving of all foods so as to enable us to assist in supplying our allies and our armies now fighting in France.

I submit, however, that if it is necessary for the people of the United States to continue to use substitutes and to continue to conserve our supply of wheat flour a better method than the one now in vogue would be to ration wheat to each person and then allow them to purchase other substitutes if they desire, and the kind of substitutes they desire. The present method compels the purchaser of a sack of flour to purchase many packages of substitutes, some of which he is unable to use, and in consequence the money paid for the substitutes and the substitutes themselves are wasted.

I notice in one of the local papers that the Food Administrator informed the retailers that they must sell cereals from 10 to 20 per cent less than wheat flour, but the compulsory purchasing of these cereals have made such a heavy demand upon the stock of the retailers that most of them cost the consumer a greater amount than wheat flour, and in many cases the consumer finds it impossible to secure the desired cereals he can use and is forced to purchase foodstuffs that are of no value to him. I have in mind a grocer's bill that a friend of mine submitted to me several weeks ago. He desired to purchase a sack of flour that cost \$1.65. In order to do so he was compelled to purchase the following:

1 sack of flour	\$1.65
6 packages puffed corn	.90
6 packages puffed wheat	.90
3 packages puffed rice	.60
4 packages cornstarch	.48
4 packages oatmeal	.60
5 pounds corn meal	.35

Making a total purchase of \$5.58. This man is working for a daily wage of \$2.70, and he was forced to labor two days in order to secure enough money to buy a small sack of flour.

It seems to me that if this man and his family were allowed to purchase a sack of flour once a week or once a month, whatever his ration might be, and then permit him to use the balance of his money to purchase whatever edibles he desires, he would be undergoing less hardship and thousands of packages of cereals that are now being wasted would be conserved, and that, of course, would have a tendency to automatically lower the price of cereals.

I have had considerable complaint from the people I represent, as my district is in close proximity to Canada, and I have been informed upon numerous occasions that the residents of Canada have little difficulty in securing flour and sugar, and there is no compulsion by the food administrator of Canada for the purchase of substitutes when purchasing flour, and I understand they have little or no trouble in securing sugar in large quantities, while the people in my district are compelled to purchase it 1 pound at a time and very often are unable to secure even that small amount. If we intend to continue the conservation of wheat and sugar and other foods,

I believe it will be necessary for a coordination in the activities of the Food Administrator of the United States and the food administrator of the Dominion of Canada.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Hoover will make some effort to create conditions more equal than those now existing in certain parts of the Dominion of Canada and the United States. The civilian population of both of these countries, I believe, are willing to assist in the conservation of all foods so as to enable our armies to have not only an abundance of food but the very best that can be obtained. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BAER. Can the gentleman explain why England and Ireland have got flour for \$8 a barrel, made of American wheat, and over here we pay \$14 and \$15 a barrel for it?

Mr. WALDOW. I have just suggested that a closer coordination of the activities of the two food administrators might help the condition, but I do not know the reason for it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Keating	Rankin
Beshlin	Farr	Keohoe	Riordan
Brodbeck	Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Robbins
Butler	Flynn	Kelly, Pa.	Roberts
Campbell, Kans.	Focht	Kennedy, R. I.	Robinson
Campbell, Pa.	Foster	Kettner	Rose
Carew	Fuller, Ill.	Key, Ohio	Rowe
Carlin	Gandy	Kless, Pa.	Rowland
Carter, Mass.	Gard	Kitchin	Rucker
Chandler, N. Y.	Garland	Kreider	Sabath
Clark, Fla.	Godwin, N. C.	LaGuardia	Sanders, La.
Clark, Pa.	Gould	Langley	Sanford
Classon	Graham, Ill.	Lesher	Scott, Pa.
Cleary	Graham, Pa.	Little	Scully
Copley	Gray, Ala.	Lufkin	Sears
Costello	Gray, N. J.	McFadden	Sells
Crago	Griest	McKeown	Slomp
Crosser	Griffin	McKinley	Sloan
Currie, Mich.	Hamill	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Snell
Dale, N. Y.	Haskell	Mann	Snook
Darrow	Hayes	Mason	Snyder
Davis	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Steele
Dempsey	Heflin	Miller, Wash.	Steele
Dent	Helntz	Moore, Pa.	Steenerson
Dewalt	Hicks	Morin	Stephens, Nebr.
Dies	Hilliard	Nolan	Sterling, Pa.
Dill	Hood	Olney	Strong
Dillon	Houston	Paige	Sullivan
Donovan	Howard	Parker, N. Y.	Swift
Dooling	Humphreys	Porter	Tague
Doremus	Husted	Powers	Templeton
Drukner	Jacoway	Price	Tilson
Dunn	James	Ragsdale	Vare
Edmonds	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey, H. T.	Watson, Pa.
Ellsworth	Johnson, Wash.	Ramsey	Webb
Estepinal	Kahn		Wilson, Tex.
Fairchild, B. L.	Kearns		Winslow

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 11945, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called under the rule and 278 Members answered to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in its present form, and opposed to many of its features in any form, particularly opposed to the very large sums which some of these items carry, put into the bill and attempted to be put through the House under the guise of a war measure.

I am a member of the committee that reported the bill, and the committee gave very careful consideration to it. A minority of the members urged very strongly the elimination of some of the provisions and a reduction of many of the amounts. There was some success attending their effort, but the bill as reported carries objectionable features and some amounts that are very much too high. I said an attempt is made to put the bill through the House under the guise of a war measure, and of that I have no doubt, nor has any member of the committee, although I should, I presume, speak only for my-

self and others who oppose the bill in its present form and as to sums that we think are extravagant.

Many of the departments of the Government are getting large amounts of money, large beyond comprehension, to be used in preparing for and carrying on the war, granted by Congress without question. Other departments, and the Department of Agriculture is one of them, seeing large sums of money appropriated for and made available for use of other departments, are asking large appropriations for themselves. Some of the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, seeing other bureaus getting large sums of money, some of them properly, are demanding large sums and large increases for themselves. Of that there can be no doubt. Some of the work that is provided for in this bill is important and necessary work. Much of it, however, is provided for in the regular appropriation bill, and the appropriation of larger amounts is unnecessary and improper and a wasteful use of money. I am, and during my entire service have been, much interested in the work of the Department of Agriculture, and have favored liberal appropriations, and at this time there are certain lines of work that must be extended and improved; but appropriations ought not to be extravagant simply because the Congress during the war is dealing in large sums of money and is making previously unheard-of appropriations. On the contrary, that is reason for economy and retrenchment when economy can be properly exercised.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I notice that the appropriations contained in this bill are largely lump sums.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I wish to speak of that later; that is one of the things I shall speak of if I have time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We do not know from the bill what the money is going to be spent for.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Some of this work is going to be done by bureaus largely as extension of their regular work, and as to some of their work, while the heads of these bureaus were before our committee and talking about their work, how it was done, why it was not extended—I mean during normal times—the reply was that it could not be extended for lack of men, on account of the difficulty of finding suitable men, but now, upon their insistent demand, the majority of the committee, as appears by this bill, proposes to provide immense sums of money for the employment of additional men and for the extension of the work of these bureaus two, three, four, five, and as high as seven times over normal years.

An examination of the bill and comparison with former bills will prove what I say to be true.

The Department of Agriculture is employing a large number of young men who are of draft age and subject to military service. The records of the department show that already the Secretary of Agriculture has certified more than 2,000 of these young men for deferred classification under the draft law. I shall at the proper time offer an amendment, which, if agreed to, will not permit employment of men of draft age or will make it impossible to certify men employed under this law for deferred classification. I might go on and particularize, Mr. Chairman, and point out the different provisions of the bill where men are asked for, and money for salaries and expenses are asked for extension of work that was carried on to the limit before the war began, carried on to the limit because of the difficulty of getting trained, suitable men to do the work. But my time is limited and I shall speak of the feature of the bill referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood the gentleman to say that there was a substantial number of the committee who were opposed to the bill as it stands. There is no minority report, is there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No minority report.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I observe that the majority report contains these words:

After very careful consideration of all the various items, the bill herewith presented represents the judgment of the committee as to the provision that should be made for the emergency activities of the department during the next fiscal year.

Will the members of the committee who agree with the gentleman offer amendments as the items are reached reducing the amounts?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; some amendments will be offered.

Mr. LONGWORTH. So that the statement in the report then is misleading, in fact, as to the committee being united.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The report is accurate to the extent that it represents the action of the committee, a ma-

jority of the committee. Of course, it says nothing about the strenuous fight that was made, the most vigorous fight I know of being made in the Committee on Agriculture during the last 12 years.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman that the bill was reported—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman will pardon me, but I do not like to yield for a statement. I thought he wished to ask a question. The gentleman has plenty of time at his disposal.

Mr. GILLET. In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] says, would it not be impossible on the floor to offer amendments segregating these lump sums? You could not do that very well on the floor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think amendments can be made segregating them.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me again, the only reason I ask the question is that it seems to me if such a vigorous fight had been made and there was such objection to certain features of the bill, it was due to the House that it be made acquainted with some of these questions before the bill came up for consideration.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Perhaps that is true. Perhaps the minority of the committee should have made a report; but of course no one, none of the minority at least, had any idea that the bill would be presented in this form. We thought it would be itemized, as bills usually are, and as this House has always insistently demanded appropriation bills shall be itemized. These are lump sums, gathered together a lot of items, and it is hard to tell how they are gathered together to make the total carried in the items in the bill.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Was not the bill reported upon the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. RUBEY? He moved that the bill be favorably reported, and that it be reported in the form in which the food-production act was reported before, and this is in identically that form, and that motion was unanimously carried. There was not a vote against it at the time in committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that I was not present at the very last meeting, the meeting at which that action was taken. If it was taken, as the gentleman states, as I presume, of course, it was, the committee at its last meeting had reached a part of the bill where it seemed there was not much opportunity for reduction and others who had opposed it, just as I had, were tired of objecting without prospect of eliminating improper features or of reducing extravagant sums.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he had no idea that the bill would be presented in this form?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I had no idea it would be presented in this form.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Because in this form it is impossible for a Member of the House who has not been through the hearings to get any idea of how the items are made up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course this bill is going to pass. I have no doubt about that, but it ought not to pass. It ought to be defeated. There is no necessity for the legislation. It will not accomplish anything except add 11,000 additional men to the pay roll. What they will have to do after they get on the pay roll I do not know, but I am beginning to get pretty tired of appropriating millions of dollars in lump sums to add more men to the pay roll, without any specific duties to perform, and it is about time we were saying so. Of course, those who are going to have the men placed on the pay roll are enthusiastic for the legislation. It is proposed, or pretended to be proposed, to increase crops, to add to the output on the farms. Last year was the worst farm-crop year we have had in many years. If the present indications are followed to a logical conclusion, we will have the largest farm crop this year that we have ever had in the United States, and after we have supplied our own needs and the needs of the allies, we will have over 200,000,000 bushels of wheat that we will not know what to do with, for which we have no storage facilities. They are proposing now to build storage warehouses to take care of the surplus wheat that it is anticipated will be

on the market in a very short time. There are over 200,000,000 bushels of wheat in Australia on the ground that is being rotted and eaten by rats, for lack of transportation facilities. It is not long since that the Agricultural Department or the Hoover department wanted to build warehouses to take care of potatoes in order that we might have potatoes to feed to the people when the time came, and men who had common sense told them that the only way to take care of potatoes was to let the farmer do it, to put them into storage on the farm, under the ground, and feed them out to the people as they were needed. But that is not what these men do who are at the heads of these departments. They do not use their heads, they use the Treasury of the United States. How much more convenient it is to have a lot of money in the Treasury of the United States where these fellows can shove their arms up to their elbows, than it is to exert the brains they are supposed to have when they are appointed to these important places. There is a greater crop of wheat growing to-day than we have ever had in the United States. The estimated return for the wheat crop this year is over 900,000,000 bushels. Last year it was less than 600,000,000 bushels, about 550,000,000 bushels. The Agricultural Department estimated 680,000,000 bushels. When a friend of mine who happens to know what crops are in the country was asked how much stock he took in the Government's crop reports, he said they were not worth the paper they are written on, that they overestimate and underestimate and do not estimate at all, but make figures, without respect to whether there is any definite justification for them or not. So, in order that we may have plenty of men to make figures, which they want to make, they add \$6,000,000 to this bill to hire new men to go throughout the country to demonstrate the best methods of raising crops.

Why, the best method of raising of crops is through the tilling of the soil by the ordinary average farmer, who knows more about it than anybody else and who will continue to raise crops as long as he can get a price for the products which he raises. All you have got to do is to show him that there is something in it for him, he will do the rest. [Applause.] You do not have to hire some shoemaker or corn doctor to go on a farm and demonstrate to a farmer the need for raising crops, he knows how to do that himself. How can you get these men with all this agricultural intelligence this bill proposes—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. In a moment—for \$6,100,000? You will probably take men who ought to be in the Army. These men are going to be taken out of the Army, made slackers—

Mr. DENISON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MADDEN. In a moment—in order to have a peaceful and easy job at a safe distance away from the guns and on the Government pay roll to instruct people who are already full of knowledge of how best to raise crops. Why, it is ridiculous. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DENISON. Does not my colleague think there ought to be a provision in here that men employed by this act ought not to be put in the deferred classification?

Mr. MADDEN. There ought not to be any man put on this pay roll who is subject to Army service. There ought to be nobody put on who has no experience, either collegiate or otherwise, in agricultural matters.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did I understand the gentleman to say item 4, carrying \$6,100,000, was only for increases of salaries?

Mr. MADDEN. Why, it is only for increased places; I do not know whether they increase salaries or not, but they just add new places, I take it, with this money. What else is it for?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Simply additional places?

Mr. MADDEN. What else could it be for?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. Every time anybody under Mr. Hoover gets authority to increase his activities, of course, the Agricultural Department wants to duplicate that. They want to increase theirs just like in the Army and Navy; if you increase the rank of a man in the Army, the man of the same rank in the Navy wants to have his rank increased. So with other departments of the Government they are competing with each other and seeing how much money they can take out of the Treasury and how much they can load as an additional burden on the backs of the taxpayers.

Oh, this is a beautiful record you are making; it will come back to plague you one of these days. But we are in war, and they say this is a war measure and an emergency measure. Yes; I suppose they do need a few more places for which there is an emergency for which otherwise no emergency exists. Why, here you are trying to compete with the Secretary of Labor.

The Secretary of Labor was authorized to establish employment agencies in order that we might get labor for the farms. He has established those employment agencies. He was authorized to send men to the farms and pay their railroad fares. Now, what do we find? We find the Secretary of Agriculture wants to do that job, too. Which one of these men will do it? Will either of them do it, or will there be such a conflict of authority that neither will do it? What men can they get for the farm that will amount to anything? You can not put a dude on the farm and make him know anything about farming. You can not take a fellow off the street who is a loafer and send him to the farm and make him worth anything to the farmer. These bills do not accomplish anything in connection with increasing farm products, except if you call it accomplishing something when you are farming the Treasury of the United States. You are developing a good crop of expenses, and you are not afraid to sow the seed which will yield new jobs to the faithful.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Another emergency my friend forgot to mention is some of the employees want to get out of the draft very badly.

Mr. MADDEN. I said that. I said that the purpose of this legislation is, in a large measure, to take men away from military service and give them nice hiding places away from the thunder of the guns. They do not want to hear the noise or be disturbed by anything but bird notes. They do not want to hear the pelting of shots flying from the guns on the French front. I have all of my blood kindred who are able to fight on the west front in France, and I am proud to say so, and so are they. [Applause.] I do not want any money taken out of the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of protecting slackers in their efforts to keep away from the dangers when the rest of our people are fighting for the honor of America.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think the gentleman in charge of the bill would object to an amendment providing that none of this money should be expended for the employment of men within the draft age?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know whether he would object, but let us try and see.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman understand it is important we shall have a few Federal employees to aid in making the country safe for Democratic candidates toward the idea of November?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, it is natural that that should be true, and if you confine it to a few I would not object; but when you make a war emergency the means, an excuse for adding millions of dollars to the payment of loafers who have no knowledge of the duties they are employed to perform, I am opposed to it. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I voice practically everything which my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says [applause on the Republican side], though I may vote for this bill. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Illinois says he will, too. I am a firm believer in the conservation of food. I think it is one of the essential necessities to our success in this war. I voted for the bill which passed Congress some time last year giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to take a census of the various food products of the United States.

I want to briefly touch upon that proposition at this time. It is within the power of the Government at the end of each month to locate exactly the amount of food commodities there are in the country, upon the farms, in the elevators, in the warehouses, the cold-storage houses, or wherever it may be. We have forty-three thousand and some odd rural-route carriers in this country who reach practically 90 per cent of all the rural districts where food is actually produced. If I recall correctly, we have something like 8,000 star-route carriers in this country performing substantially the same, identical service that a rural-route carrier performs, inasmuch as they reach the farmers and put the farmers' mail in the box.

Now, my ideas may not be sound; they may be illogical; but it has occurred to me time and time again that if the Agricultural Department or the Bureau of Census, working through the Agricultural Department, would prepare a little card and place these cards in the hands of postmasters at the offices where the rural routes originate, and have the route carriers deposit those cards in the farmers' boxes, calling upon the farmer to state how many bushels of wheat, rye, and oats that

he thrashed, and the number of tons of hay and the number of bushels of potatoes and corn that he raised, and how many head of live stock he has upon the farm, that that would be a complete scientific census of the foodstuffs and supplies on hand in this country, and easily available, without any extra cost or charge whatever. [Applause.] And those cards should be frankable, so that the farmer would not be at any trouble or expense in sending them back to the Department of Agriculture.

That would give that department the point of view as to the food produced in the country and the supplies that are actually on hand. It would be able to locate where the food commodities were, and by that means they could easily trace the sum total of the amount of grain or other commodities at the warehouses or storage plants, and so forth. Believing that, I am unable to see why we should spend millions upon millions of dollars in taking a food survey of the country, when we already have the organization, working six days out of every week, and reaching probably 95 or 98 per cent of the men in this country who actually produce food. But for some reason or other—I do not know why—the Agricultural Department has not seen fit to adopt it, unless it be, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said, they desire to make places for a large number of employees, traveling over this country and trying to tell men, men of practical experience, how to farm. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. FESS. As I remember, the gentleman urged this method of getting this very data when the Agricultural bill was up.

Mr. COX. I did.

We are soon to have a census bill in the midst of this war. I had occasion a few years ago to look up the way other nations took their census. I found that some of the European Governments took their census through their mail facilities. We are about to spend many millions for the purpose of taking a census, when by utilization of the mail facilities we could cut it out and save the money, so much needed, to prosecute the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. I may vote for this bill, but it will mean the stacking up of jobs here; and that is all it is. In my judgment, it will not produce an extra bushel of wheat or an extra bushel of corn or raise an extra pound of pork. I think the time has come—although I recognize that a man almost takes his political life in his hands to get up on the floor here and say anything against appropriations; we have got to accept it—

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not have to vote for this bill if he does not wish to do so.

Mr. COX. I know I do not. I will exercise my spirit of independence when my name is called. But I do think the time has come when we ought to cut these appropriations to the very marrow, unless it be an appropriation designed exclusively for the Army or the Navy.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How can we cut appropriations when they are brought in here in a lump sum, so that we do not know how the money is to be spent or what it is to be used for?

Mr. COX. I do not know about that. We might strike out some of the items.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it was Madame Roland who, agonized by the excesses of the French Revolution, exclaimed, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" The time is coming, if it is not already here, when every good patriot will feel like exclaiming, "O Slogan of the winning of the war, what useless, senseless, wicked, wasteful extravagances are proposed in thy name!"

This bill has a compelling title: "To provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products." What patriot in these times of stress and war can vote against purposes thus expressed? And yet there is not a man on this floor, in my opinion, who in his heart of hearts believes that all or a large proportion of this \$11,000,000 of appropriation will accomplish beyond question considerable results toward the winning of the war or largely increasing the agricultural

products of the country. We do not know yet, although we would like to know, just what force of motive power is to be developed by the Liberty motor. We hope that it will be all and more than we expect of it, and we hope that it will develop its claimed 400 horsepower under the most trying and difficult circumstances and conditions. But however powerful it may prove to be, as an instrument of propulsion it will not be a circumstance to the compelling power of the \$6,000,000 item contained in this bill. For what? For the purpose of employing busybodies to go around over the country and take the time of busy farmers and farmers' wives and tell them what they ought to do. It is not a far cry to November, and \$6,000,000 will go a long way toward hiring folks to travel hither and yon throughout the country, making the land safe for Democratic candidates. That is to a large extent the compelling force behind this legislation, and it is well that some one should state it plainly.

I am going to vote for this bill if it is trimmed as I hope it will be trimmed, and as it ought to be trimmed, and not because I approve all of its items even as they are likely to be after some trimming, but because there are needed and useful activities provided for in the bill and because, having followed the policy of resolving every doubt in favor of the request of the administration's departments in their request for funds, I deem it my duty after having made every effort to perfect legislation and reduce appropriations clearly unnecessarily large to vote for the legislation and appropriations after getting them in the best form and amount possible. If the items in this bill which provide for agents, inspectors, investigators, and demonstrators are not reduced, and if the items which duplicate the activities of other bureaus are not stricken out on the amendments that will be offered, the fault will not rest on this side and you gentlemen on the Democratic side and the administration must take the blame. I shall vote for the bill in the best form we can get. The Agricultural Department has done good work. It will continue to do good work. But the Agricultural Department does not need any such funds as these in addition to its regular appropriations in order to do all that is necessary and all that can be wisely and properly done to stimulate the agricultural production of the country.

We have reached a point when every department of the Government comes before appropriating committees trying to get their share of the swag of war. That is what it amounts to. One department sees another augmenting its appropriation and extending its activities, and they just hanker, not to do something that is necessary, but to get "their share" of the big appropriations that are made even if they must occupy the same identical field of some other department or bureau. They want to "git" while the "gittin'" is good. We have just completed a hearing in a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations where the representatives of the Department of Labor came before us and outlined an organization which has been carefully, completely, and, in my opinion, wisely perfected in that department for the purpose of supplying the industries and the agriculture of the country with labor. No doubt the story of that organization has come to the Department of Agriculture and they want half a million dollars to cover the same ground and for the same purpose.

The Department of Labor has and will have abundant funds for all necessary purposes in securing and distributing labor, including funds to advance where necessary to pay for transportation. They have a fine organization; they can cover the field without confusion or conflict of plan or purpose, but the Agricultural Department can not tolerate the idea of anybody having anything to do with farm labor but themselves.

The county farm agents are doing a fine work. I took occasion to refer to it approvingly quite recently on this floor. There are further activities along this and other lines we are taking up and may well pursue during the war, but the sums carried in this bill for these purposes are scandalous when we think that the taxpayers and bond buyers must furnish the money. It becomes almost criminal—these excessive sums in addition to the large regular appropriations—when we reflect that they are to pay for the personal services of an army of several thousand men who ought to be either on the firing line or engaged in productive enterprises.

These days, when we need farm help as we never did before, is no time to take men from production and possibly exempt them from the draft, as 2,000 of the employees of the Agriculture Department have been, and pay them the money we are supposed to be raising to carry on the war, to gad about, teaching farmers what they already know much better than the majority of these hurriedly selected instructors do. The whole scheme and plan is forced, overdone, and, to a large extent, ridiculous—from the brilliant plan to send patriots seeking

bullet-proof jobs around to tell farmers' wives how to make cottage cheese to the almost inspired announced purpose of sending spies out to locate supplies of spuds. When will the Committee on Agriculture do its duty in protecting the country against Treasury raids of this sort?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARAWAY). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, it was not my intention to say a word in relation to this bill, but I do not believe that in the seven or nearly eight years in which I have been a Member of this House I have listened to as much misrepresentation as I have listened to within the last 15 or 20 minutes. Gentlemen have gotten up on the floor of this House and talked about this bill and made assertions concerning it that are absolutely incorrect, that are absolutely untrue, and why they do it I do not know, unless it be that they simply do not know any better, that they are not informed as to work of the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of this act.

This identical bill was passed by this very Congress a year ago. We provided for these appropriations for the purpose of stimulating agriculture from one end of this country to the other. That work is being done now. The men have been employed and they are now in the field.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. No; I can not yield in five minutes. Every one of those men has been employed under the regulations of the civil service, every one of them, and to-day they are in the employment of the Department of Agriculture under civil-service regulations.

The proposition here before us to-day is whether or not we shall continue this same work and permit those men who have been employed under the former bill to continue their work. The appropriations made under that bill expire on the 30th of June. The term of every man who is now in the field, who is now employed in the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of that bill, will expire on the 30th day of June.

This bill is to continue that work. If you thought a year ago that it was an important work to be done, if you passed the bill then and said to the people, "We are going to increase agriculture, we are going to promote agriculture in every line from one end of the country to the other," and if you voted for it then do you want to stop that work or do you want to continue that work?

Much has been said here about these men being exempt from military service. In the Department of Agriculture there are, including the men employed under this act, something like 22,000 men. Before the war began we had between sixteen and seventeen thousand men in the service of the Department of Agriculture. There have now been placed in deferred classes, upon the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, as men especially qualified for agricultural work, about 2,000 men, and no other man in the Department of Agriculture within the limits of 21 to 31 years of age has been in any way exempted from the call to arms.

These men who are now in the field, except those 2,000 that I have mentioned, who are within the age limit, are within the call and are not exempted. And even these men were not exempted; they were simply put in a deferred class. The Secretary of Agriculture puts these men, or rather he recommends that they be put, in a deferred class, and then it is up to the local boards to say, after examining into the conditions surrounding them, whether or not the request of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be granted. It is up to the local boards to determine that question on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, and they can put them in a deferred class if they want to or they can refuse to put them in a deferred class.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. No; I must decline to yield. I have only six minutes.

Much has been said about the large number of men running around through the country, and about the expenditure of this \$6,000,000 appropriation that we recommend. Some years ago we passed the Smith-Lever bill; I prefer to call it the Lever bill. [Applause.] Practically every man then in this House voted for that bill, to put farm demonstrators at work in all parts of the country. In that bill it was provided that the appropriation be increased year by year until, by and by, we would get enough money, in cooperation with the States, to put a county agent of high character in every county in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. RUBEY. When this war broke out we decided that we would not wait for that, but we would put a farm demonstrator in every county in the United States. This \$6,000,000 is to accomplish that purpose, to place a farm demonstrator in every county in the State of Illinois, whence comes the gentleman who spoke a moment ago against this bill. These men are going to be placed in every county in Illinois and in every county in every other State of the Union for farm-demonstration work.

If this bill is so bad as gentlemen have stated who have spoken against it this afternoon, why do they not vote against it? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for four minutes. The gentleman does not seem to be present.

Mr. HAUGEN. He has temporarily stepped out.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to call the gentleman's attention to the number of people proposed to be employed outside of the classified service. I desire to say that on page 35 the gentleman will find that 3,707 are suggested in the extension work in the Northern and Western States and 2,110 in the Southern States. Those together would make 5,817 who are outside of the classified service.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. In just a minute. I call the gentleman's attention to the 2,938 county agents, every one of them outside of the classified service. That makes the number 8,755, and yet the gentleman gets up here before this House and says that misrepresentation has been made. There are at least 8,000 of those outside the classified service. I have not had time to go over the list carefully, but I think I can find a thousand or two more. According to the estimates of the department, in all, 11,907 would be employed.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman knows how those farm demonstrators are appointed. He knows how they are appointed by the States themselves.

Mr. HAUGEN. They are outside the classified service.

Mr. RUBEY. I understand that, but in those cases they are not appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All of those appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture are in the classified service, appointed under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HAUGEN. They do not come in under the civil-service examinations by any means.

Mr. RUBEY. Those appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; but these are not appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUBEY. They are appointed by the State authorities.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am speaking of the number of people outside the classified service.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, is the time exhausted on the other side?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is not there more than one county agent in each county?

Mr. HAUGEN. There are 5,400 of them, about two to a county, and it is proposed to increase the number.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is there any necessity for having two to each county?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is what the bill calls for. For the information of the House, let me give the gentleman the number. The total number estimated is 11,907. Under the same bill a year ago there were 6,280. The total increase over 1918 is 5,627. The total number estimated for 1919 was temporary 690, permanent 11,300. The total number employed in the department is about 20,000, and in the extension and demonstration field service from 5,500 to 6,000 people.

Mr. MONDELL. And none of these people are under the civil service?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not in the extension service or the county agents estimating crops, and there are 8,000 of them.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman from Missouri was mistaken.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman from Missouri was not mistaken; the gentleman from Missouri stated that the men appointed under this bill by the Secretary of Agriculture are under the civil service. These other gentlemen that the gentleman from Iowa is talking about are men in the service appointed by the various States upon their recommendation alone.

Mr. HAUGEN. The majority of the people provided for in this bill are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and every one of them outside of the classified service. Besides there are others appointed without examination as provided for by the civil-service laws.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has nine minutes remaining.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I fully agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] a moment ago that I have never in my service seen a bill on the floor of this House—and I have been here a longer time than the gentleman from Missouri—that has been so persistently and energetically misrepresented as the bill now before us. The gentlemen who have made these statements evidently have not read the bill and evidently do not know its provisions or they certainly would not make the broadside statements of condemnation which they do make, which are totally at variance with the provisions of the bill or anything authorized in the bill.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] in his speech the other day, which I have read in the RECORD, stated that I admitted on the floor of the House that we provided for 11,000 additional employees outside of the civil service. I did not make that admission; I do not make it now, because that is not in accordance with the information I have and I am sure is incorrect.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman desires to be fair, I know. Will he yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes. I not only want to be fair, but I will be fair.

Mr. HAUGEN. I said that practically all of them were outside of the classified service.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. What I am complaining about is the statement in the gentleman's speech that I admitted the proposition, which I did not. The question was asked me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and I disagreed with him. I not only did not admit it, but I denied it at the time and deny it now.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman will admit that there are 8,000 outside the classified service.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; I will not. The Lever bill provided for the appointment of many of those men. It passed a number of years ago, practically by unanimous consent on the floor of this House. Nobody objected to it, and it provided for the appointment of these men throughout the country, and it provides the manner in which they shall be appointed and the manner of their appointment is not changed in this bill or any other; they are continued to be appointed under that bill up to the present time.

There are employed in the Department of Agriculture 22,683 people. Of this number 15,679 are employed under the regular appropriations of the agricultural bill. There are 4,508 people employed under the cooperative plan. Under the legislation of Congress, the people employed under the cooperative plan are permitted to be selected by the local communities in which they live. They are selected by the counties, by the municipalities, or by the boards of supervisors, or by the county boards of administration, and they pay a part of their salaries and the Government pays a part and therefore it is impossible for them to be placed under the civil service. In deed and in truth they are not strictly speaking employees of the Department of Agriculture or employees of the Government of the United States, but they are cooperative employees on the part of the Government of the United States and the local communities in which they perform the services in which they are engaged. Therefore 4,508 people employed in that way are not under the civil service. But every employee in the Department of Agriculture that is appointed as an employee of the department under the provisions of this bill and the last bill that passed, which was just like this, and under the annual appropriation bill, are under the civil service and will remain under the civil service.

Gentlemen have tried to bring in propositions about the draft. They have said that this bill is an effort to keep people out of the war. I did not know there was any political matter in this bill. If they want to make that charge let them make it and

be responsible for it. But the man who makes the charge charges the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of the Agricultural Department with willfully making an effort to keep people out of the war by putting them in bomb-proof positions and shielding them from going forth to fight the battles of their country. I would not make that statement anywhere, and I would certainly not make it on the floor of this House, because I do not believe the statement is true. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture or any official of the Department of Agriculture or any official of this Government is guilty of anything of that kind. They are as loyal and patriotic as you are and have no more desire to keep people out of the Army than you have.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have not the time; I have but a few minutes. There has been, as was stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], about 2,000 scientists, experts, and specially qualified and useful men in the department who have been put in the deferred classes, upon the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture, by the local boards. All of them have not been even placed in deferred classes by the local boards. A young gentleman came into my office the other day who had been certified. The local board refused to exempt him or place him in a deferred class. He wanted me to try to help him out. I told him the local boards had absolute authority in the matter, and that the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture or any other department could merely furnish the certificate or the evidence on which to act, but that the local boards are the ones who pass upon it, and that if they had denied him exemption he would have to shoulder a gun and go to the front. He smiled like a good American and went out of my office, and went into the training camp where he had been ordered to go. Therefore it will be very readily seen that they have not all been put in deferred classes; but those have been deferred who have been necessary for carrying on the work of the Government, and you will practically destroy the Agricultural Department if you take the people out of there whom the Secretary said were absolutely necessary and who, because of their qualifications, were required to remain there in order to continue this work. Twelve or fifteen hundred have been taken out of the Department of Agriculture and have gone under the draft into the Army. All of these people outside, who are in the service away from here, who are subject to the draft, must go before the local board, and if they can not furnish justification within the provisions of the law as passed by Congress, they will be denied exemption or deferred classification and will have to shoulder a gun like the rest of the boys, and ought to do so. [Applause.]

There has been a great deal of talk about this money going for the employment of additional employees in the department simply to do political work throughout the country, to build up the Democratic cause. There is no foundation in fact for any such statement. No unnecessary employees will be employed. The Department of Agriculture does not play politics and no such statement ought to be made. There were some additional employees required. They have been employed under the provision of the former bill, 7,004 people. Because there is necessity to employ additional men is no reason why the provisions of this bill are not good. You need men to do work. You can not do work without men. You can not cultivate a farm unless you provide men on the farm. If you have 100 acres it will take so many men, and if you have 500 acres you will have to have so many more men. The United States is simply a great farm, under the supervision of the Agricultural Department, in which we are producing products to feed our Army and our own people and to sustain our allies. Do you not want to help do that? If so, quit criticizing and obstructing this bill, for that is its sole purpose, and when it becomes law it will secure that result. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," approved August 10, 1917 (40 Stats., p. 273), there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums for the purposes indicated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, at the end of line 2, add the following:

"Provided, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in paying salary or expenses of any man who on account of employment in which he is or may be engaged under the provisions of this act has been or shall hereafter be certified by the Secretary of Agri-

culture or by any other official of the Department of Agriculture for deferred classification, or by action of any other Federal official or authority has been or may hereafter be placed in a deferred class under act No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, or under any act amendatory thereof that has been or shall hereafter be enacted."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been referred to, and I gather from what has been said on both sides of the Chamber there will be little opposition to the amendment. As has been stated, the Secretary of Agriculture has himself certified for deferred classification more than 2,000 of the young men employed in one capacity and another in the Department of Agriculture, and no one knows how many of the young men throughout the country employed in the kind of work provided for in this bill or engaged in other work for the Department of Agriculture have been placed in deferred classes by local or district boards on account of such employment, and so classified without the knowledge of the Secretary. This amendment is designed to remove from all of the young men of the country the opportunity of entering the service of the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of this act and thereby having or giving reason for deferred classification under the draft law. It seems to me there ought to be no objection to this amendment. The draft act, as it is called, authorizes the exemption of men on account of employment in certain of the industries of the country, including agriculture. The words "including agriculture" were added to the bill while it was under consideration on the floor on the motion of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It was supposed that some attention would be paid to that provision, and for a time there was as far as it related to farm labor; but it is learned now that few, if any, of the young men of the country actually employed on farms and needed there are excused from a place in class 1 on account of their employment; and the boards throughout the country are becoming more and more strict and are refusing to grant deferred classification to farm laborers. That is, men who are actually employed on farms are denied deferred classification.

They are refused the privilege which the draft act was intended to give them. Thus men on the farms, real farmers, are taken from the farms and put into the Army, while young men just like them, who get jobs with the Secretary of Agriculture to go out and try to tell farmers how to farm, will on their own application or by action of the Secretary be placed in a deferred class and be able to draw good salaries and escape military service; that is, they will if my amendment is not adopted.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I can not now. Under this bill, without amendment, and in the Department of Agriculture thousands and thousands of young men are employed and will be employed and opportunity will be given for them to plead that employment in order to receive a deferred classification. It ought to be impossible. But this bill is necessary, much of it, although, as I have said when speaking a few minutes ago, much money is asked for simply because other departments are getting it. It is a grab, and many men will be employed. It will be easy enough to get men beyond the draft age, men who are exempt from military service on account of age or for disability. They ought to be employed. There is need of soldiers. We ought not to take 2,000, as we have—and perhaps 2,000 more if this bill shall become law—and give them a chance, practically invite them, to evade military service. The gentleman from Missouri says only scientists have been exempted. Two thousand scientists! Everybody knows there are not 2,000 scientists in the department unless we adopt the definition of a scientist sometimes given, "a man who discovers something that everybody knew before and writes about it in language that nobody can understand." [Laughter and applause.] Here is an opportunity for the employment of some 6,000 men more than are now employed. It seems to me it would be only proper, plain justice to require them to be taken from a class of men not subject to military service. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted for the primary reason that this is certainly not the place to enact law in reference to the draft. If the provisions suggested by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan are proper provisions and ought to be placed in the law, then he should introduce a bill to that effect, and have it referred to the proper committee of this House, which is the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee is absolutely conversant with what the law now is and could sift it out and determine after a full investigation of it as to whether or not it is such an amendment as

should be placed in the draft law governing the selection of those to enter the Army.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. I judge from what the gentleman is now saying that he is not as anxious to have the slacker excluded from this force as he seemed to be a few moments ago when defending the bill.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If the gentleman intimates I am in favor of having slackers exempted, he misrepresents me.

Mr. MONDELL. Why does the gentleman object to an amendment which will make that impossible?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I object to this amendment because it ought not to be placed in a bill of this character that has nothing on earth to do with the selection of soldiers and nothing on earth to do with the organization of the Army, but it ought to be passed, if passed at all, by regular process of legislation, coming from the committee which ought to consider it, and consider it in connection with the law as it stands to-day. Now, I can not yield further. I think it would be a dangerous thing, Mr. Chairman, to attempt upon the floor of the House, simply upon an amendment introduced without consideration by a committee and without time to know exactly the full force and effect of the language that is contained in the amendment offered, to adopt it.

It is not only amending the fundamental law under which the Army has been selected up to the present time, but under which it is proposed to select the remainder of the Army which shall be called in the future. I could not tell, and I doubt whether the gentleman from Michigan himself could tell, exactly how far this amendment would go or exactly to what extent it might be applied when construed in its full force and effect, because it is impossible, unless you have the other law before you, to see exactly the words in the law that it would strike out or what language it would modify or it would change, and you would have to know all that before it would be possible for you to know the effect of this amendment. Therefore I say it would be a very dangerous proposition to undertake upon such an amendment and without consideration and without investigation and without full knowledge of all the legislation as it exists at the present time to amend it in this way. Now, the gentleman says we need soldiers. Yes; we need them, and they are going from all over the country, and they will continue to go under the law as it is to-day. There are plenty of them going courageously to fight for their flag and for their country and resent the insults which have been offered to it, thereby proving themselves genuine patriots. The patriotism of this country is not to be questioned anywhere. There may be a few possible exceptions of disloyalty, but they are rare and few, indeed, and becoming more so, and, as the gentleman said a moment ago, the local exemption boards are becoming more careful than they were in the past, and they are not granting exemptions or deferred classifications at the present time in instances where they granted them at the outset. They will grow more strict as the days go by, because public opinion will grow more intense and patriotism grow to fever heat and will require that the man who secures exemption or deferred classification will have to come not only within the spirit but within the letter of the law before he can be granted any full or partial exemption. That being the case, I think it is best to leave the law as it is and not amend it in a manner in which you could not know what the effect of the amendment would be.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What probable effect can this amendment have upon the draft law, which simply provides that salaries should not be paid to men subject to the draft? It does not amend the law in any respect.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It does amend it, because it says that nobody shall be employed or put in deferred classes or exempted. If the amendment does not change the existing law what is the necessity to adopt it? They are not exempt now upon the certificate of the Secretary of Agriculture unless exemption or deferred classification is granted by the exemption board. This would amend the draft law, and this is no place to amend it, on a bill which provides for the production of food and has nothing to do with the Army, except to produce food to feed the soldiers who are patriotically fighting for our country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the gentleman is acquainted with the amendments offered on several occasions by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] limiting appropriations, to the effect that they should not be used to employ persons to exempt them from the draft?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I would not have any objection to an amendment of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. This amendment is along the same line.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It may be along the same line, but it goes much further than that. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the Provost Marshal General has just issued an order rescinding a previous order made by him, under which it was declared to be the policy of the Provost Marshal General's office in administering the draft, when men actually engaged in agricultural production in class 1 were reached in the regular call of the quota, to place those men at the foot of the quota instead of calling them immediately. That means that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of men who are actually engaged in agriculture, who have put in crops, will be taken from their farms, and those farms left idle and the operators sent to training camps. I do not know of any reason, when men actually engaged in farming, in the raising of crops, are taken from their farms, with resultant financial loss to them and a loss of food to the Government, and sent to training camps, why we should exempt men in the Department of Agriculture who are doing no more than to talk about raising crops. And I will therefore support the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

We are fast arriving at the time, if we have not already reached it, Mr. Chairman, when we must make a survey of our situation with a view of determining the relative importance of agricultural and industrial production and military participation. We must determine just what the necessities of the occasion are, just what limitations we can put upon production, and, having determined it, we must apply the draft with reference to those determinations. In my opinion we have almost, if we have not actually, reached the irreducible minimum of the men who can be actually taken from the farm and placed in the trenches, if we are to produce anything like the amount of food necessary in order to maintain those armies.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Does the gentleman know whether the resolution passed by Congress several weeks ago to furlough soldiers who want to work on the farms went into effect or not, and whether or not they are furloughing soldiers who desire to work on the farms?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know definitely to what extent that provision has been taken advantage of, but it is my impression that very, very few men have been furloughed, largely because of the limitation of the department under which men who are in contemplation of being sent abroad are not furloughed, and under existing circumstances practically everybody in the Army is in that situation at the moment.

This bill proposes to increase the supply of agricultural products by reducing the losses resulting from plant and animal diseases and insects and by direct propaganda to stimulate agricultural production and to produce the highest and most efficient uses of our agricultural resources.

In my opinion, this propaganda will be of little avail unless it is accompanied with a policy both more definite and more equitable than now exists in the regulation of the prices of farm products and the prices of the materials and machinery necessary for their production, and also in respect to agricultural labor. It is my intention to discuss only that part of the production equation which is represented by the labor situation.

It has been announced, doubtless with some official sanction, that it is the desire and the purpose of the Government to increase our military forces in France to 3,000,000 and perhaps to 4,000,000 men. With this purpose I am in entire accord, but it must be apparent to anyone who is at all conversant with the labor situation in the country that the increased number of men can not and ought not to be taken from the industry of the country without definite information as to the effect of taking them upon that industry or without careful provision of the policy which is to characterize their translation from industry to the Army.

The number of men who can be placed on the fighting line in France will be determined by other factors than the provisions of any legislation creating an army on paper which the Congress may adopt. It will be limited by training, transportation, and port facilities abroad, by the amount of shipping available both for transport and cargo, and also by possible available training facilities on this side of the water.

It would be the utmost folly to take men more or less indiscriminately and more or less uniformly from industry in the

country generally and put them into training in this country without reckoning on the possibility of transporting and supplying those men as fast as they are trained. Ordinary common sense would seem to dictate that men should not be taken from industry and trained faster than our transportation facilities, both here and abroad, can carry them to and supply them at the front.

We have in the United States to-day in the different cantonments some thousands of troops, perhaps hundreds of thousands, who have been in training in this country more than nine months and who, I am convinced, have long since reached the limit of the training which it is feasible to give them on this side. Further drafts of men from industry ought to be made with reference to proper calculations of the amount of time required for training here and available transportation facilities here and abroad.

These preliminary observations bring me to the suggestion that if we are soon to transfer the large number of men contemplated from industry to the military forces we are face to face with the problem of determining the relative importance in our participation in the war of agricultural production, industrial production, and military participation. We must determine whether the necessities of our military participation in the war are now so great as to justify limitations upon agricultural or industrial production and just where these limitations shall begin and how far they shall proceed.

With the exception of England, whose agricultural production is in the whole scheme of agricultural production rather insignificant, the agricultural production of every country abroad engaged in the war has been and will continue to be materially decreased; and it will be decreased in the United States unless it is determined in advance that agricultural production is of so great importance in our participation in the war that it must not be limited under any circumstances.

In my opinion, the labor available for agriculture will soon be, if it has not already been, reduced by volunteering and the operations of the draft to a point where further reductions can not be accomplished without decreasing production.

In this connection it must be remembered that a large amount of the labor on industrial production is nominally drawn from the farm and that the stupendous increases of industrial production due to the war, coupled with the high wages offered by governmental as well as by private industrial enterprises engaged upon war work, have still further depleted the supply of agricultural labor, and that these high wages will serve in a measure, at least, to recruit from the farm-labor supply the men taken out of industry by the draft. Thus the whole force of the draft, as well as increased industrial production and high wages, implements itself against the farm-labor supply.

If agricultural production is to be maintained at a normal level, to say nothing of increasing it, and a normal supply, at least, is imperatively necessary in the prosecution of the war, we shall be obliged to abandon the application of the draft which heretofore has operated with practically uniform results against all of the industry of the country, agriculture included. In its place we must adopt a policy which will permit of an operation of the draft with relation to the different industries of the country corresponding to their importance and necessity in our participation in the war.

The adoption of this policy will necessitate a classification of industry with relation to its importance and essentiality to the conduct of the war as a basis for determining where the weight of the effective operation of the draft ought to fall first. This basis having been determined, the larger effect of the draft would seem naturally to operate first against those employed in nonessential industries, and, secondly, against those industries where the labor of women can be most conveniently substituted for the labor of men, including the industries directly engaged in the manufacture of war munitions.

The farming industry is not generally susceptible to the employment of women. In large part, particularly in those sections of the country where diversified farming is carried on, farm labor is essentially skilled labor, but even assuming that skilled labor is available for farming, it would be folly to take from the farms the skilled farm owner or tenant and to supplant him with skilled farm labor drawn from some other source.

The application of the draft has already served in many places to take from the farm the farm owner or tenant, leaving the farm itself unoperated.

If the total number of troops now contemplated should be drawn from class 1, thousands of farm owners and farm tenants, as well as thousands of men engaged in farm labor, will be withdrawn from the farm and thousands of acres now planted will be unharvested as a result.

The farmers of the country seek no exemption from the military burdens of the war. Many of them, with far-seeing vision,

however, believe that their services on the farm are of much greater value to the Government in the prosecution of the war than their services in the trenches could possibly be. If the military necessity of the country requires it the young farmers will willingly abandon their farms for the trenches, but surely such abandonment ought not to be required of them until a careful and comprehensive review of our participation in the war in all of its phases compels us to the conclusion that our military necessity requires it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if it is not out of order I should like to be recognized again.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] says it is not right to adopt this amendment, because it is not thoroughly understood. The gentleman himself has not taken the trouble to read it. If he will read it, he will find it is easily understood. It is plain and simple. It does no more than this, namely, to refuse deferred classification to any man on account of employment under the provisions of this act. It does not interfere with the ordinary operations of the Department of Agriculture or with the thousands and thousands of men now employed in that department under other laws—the scientists and the others that we talk about—and all others who are not employed under the provisions of this act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, the gentleman's amendment would not prevent the department from employing any man who was not within the draft age, but if they can not get men outside the draft ages they ought not to take the men who are in the draft ages.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It is a fact that none of the departments at the present time, so far as I am informed, are taking anybody into the employment that are within the draft age. They are excluded.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Not in my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If that be true, why is it that the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the exemption of 2,000 men in his department?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is true. And if we permit it, many men to be employed under the provisions of this act will take the deferred classification on account of the employment that this act will give them. We ought to forbid that, and it is no reflection upon the Secretary of Agriculture or anybody else. I am tired of hearing this talk about reflection on the President if we question the advisability of giving him unlimited authority. I am tired of hearing this talk about reflection upon the Secretary of Agriculture if we suggest a limitation upon his authority. The fact is that gentlemen in high official places are now so burdened with work that it is positively impossible for them to give personal consideration even to a small part of the duties that Congress imposes upon them, and the result is that they leave a large part of such work to their subordinates. The heads of the departments have not even time to look over carefully the recommendations made by the subordinates. The result is that subordinates do much of the work and exercise much of the authority, while we try to make ourselves believe the high officials do it. The amendment proposed by me will be no reflection upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

And the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] speaks about the very, very strong sentiment in this country against exempting anyone who is fit for military service or permitting him to be placed in a deferred classification. Then, why can not Congress respond to that sentiment and pass an act in accordance with it?

This amendment of mine is easily understood. It was not drawn for the purpose of deceiving anyone or embarrassing the Department of Agriculture in any of its activities. It is as plain as words can make it. It simply would prevent any man who is to be employed under this act from claiming exemption or deferred classification on account of the employment under this act. Could anything be more simple? Could there be more justice in any proposition relating to the employment of labor or the enlistment of soldiers? [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEX. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I want to say just a word or two in answer to the statements made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. The Secretary of Agriculture, as I said a moment ago, has certified about 2,000 experts and men of experience in the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, men who are already in the Department of Agriculture, asking that they be placed in deferred classes. I am informed that the Secretary of Agriculture has given his personal attention to every single, solitary application that has come into his office asking for a deferred classification, and that he has absolutely refused to be guided by the recommendations of anybody else or refer this matter to anybody else, but has acted upon each case himself personally.

I say that this proposed amendment is a reflection on the Secretary of Agriculture, and I say it advisedly. This amendment here would have been clearly subject to a point of order if the point had been made at the proper time. You are asked here to amend another act which has no relation to, this whatever. If the point of order had been made, it would have clearly been subject to a point of order, but it was not made. We preferred to leave the matter to the House.

Now, then, when we passed the draft act we said to the Secretary of Labor, as we said to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the head of every other department of this Government, "You shall have authority to certify to the local board men who are within the draft age and whom you absolutely need in your department, men who are absolutely essential to the work of your department." We said that to every department of the Government, and now here to-day you are seeking to amend that act by taking that authority away from the Secretary of Agriculture alone. It can not be taken otherwise than as a reflection on the Secretary of Agriculture, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEX. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is doubtless aware of the fact that in two, and I think in three, bills we have already inserted similar provisions. Was that an insult to the heads of those particular departments that had to do with those appointments?

Mr. RUBEX. As I said a moment ago, the Secretary of Agriculture has not the authority to place those men in a deferred class. The only possible thing he can do is to say to the various local boards, "We need this man; he is essential to our work." If he does that that local board looks into the situation locally and passes upon it. It is not within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to place any individual in a deferred class.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEX. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be in the power of the Secretary of Agriculture, however, to refuse to take a man into this service who was not in a deferred class, would it not?

Mr. RUBEX. I think not.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would be. They would not be appointed.

Mr. RUBEX. You mean it is not in the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint a man who is not in a deferred class?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I say this would take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the power to appoint to one of these positions a man who was not in a deferred class or who is of draft age. I think that ought to be done.

Mr. RUBEX. It applies to every man who has heretofore been appointed under the provisions of this act. There are only a few men who have been placed in a deferred class under this law and who will be exempted for a time by this law.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEX. Yes.

Mr. COX. In a general way, what are these 2,000 men doing who have been given exemption?

Mr. RUBEX. In a general way they are specialists, men employed in the Department of Agriculture, many of them who have been there a number of years.

Mr. COX. But they are not men engaged in plowing and sowing and mowing and reaping?

Mr. RUBEX. Oh, I will say to the gentleman that in the Department of Labor there are very few men who are absolutely using the shovel and the hoe and the pick and the ax. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. And many of them ought to be put to that work. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUBEX. And it is the same way in the Department of Agriculture. Everybody knows that the men employed in the Department of Agriculture are not the men who actually till the soil.

Mr. COX. They will be.

Mr. RUBEX. If we are going to put those men on the farm and have them go out to work, we had better get ready to change

the entire plan and aim of the Department of Agriculture, not only of the Nation but of every State in the Union.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be just as well for us to read the amendment again. It reads:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 2, at the end of line 2, add the following:

"Provided, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in paying salary or expenses of any man who on account of employment in which he is or may be engaged under the provisions of this act has been or shall hereafter be certified by the Secretary of Agriculture or by any other official of the Department of Agriculture for deferred classification, or by action of any other Federal official or authority has been or may hereafter be placed in a deferred class under act No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, or under any act amendatory thereof that has been or shall hereafter be enacted."

That does not affect the military law of this country one iota. It affects nothing but this act.

It does two things. In the first place it absolutely closes the doors of hope for the would-be slacker who is looking to this place as a haven of refuge. I do not think that any man in this House would object to that. In the second place it will be very, very salutary in establishing a policy at the outset respecting the putting in of men above the draft age, so that they will not be constantly changing to put in men of the draft age and then let them out when called by the board, and then take them out and put older men in or take other men subject to the draft. There is such a constant change going on in all these departments as keeps a constant stream of newcomers entering the department. But if this amendment goes in we know that from the very outset they will not have any men in here who will be removed in a few weeks or months and thereby cripple the department.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No department of the Government is appointing anybody as a clerk or to any position of that character who is within the draft age under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MEEKER. Does the gentleman mean between 21 and 31?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Then why the opposition to this amendment?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The order has been already issued.

Mr. MEEKER. Then I can not understand the opposition to the amendment if that is the fact. It looks as if the department would welcome the legislation.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield for me to ask the chairman a question?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman contend that a man already in the department should be treated differently from the man that is to be called in?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I do not think there should be any difference between them—all should stand alike. But I am opposed to the amendment to the draft law of this kind being put in this bill without any consideration.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman say that the department refuses to take men under the civil service of draft age?

Mr. MEEKER. That is what the gentleman from Mississippi says.

Mr. PLATT. I know that I have received several letters indicating that that is not the fact.

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman from New York uses a shorter word than I would myself, but I think the chairman of the committee is mistaken. Now, it seems to me that we might as well be frank about this matter. They talk about there being no slacker sentiment in this country. That is bunk. There are thousands of men who are trying to find bullet-proof jobs, and we all know it. Every time one of these men can worm his way into a place the minute he gets in he begins to try to build up a wall behind himself so they can not pull him out. The thing that Congress will do by this amendment, as far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, will be to stop the putting of men in who will be there only a short time before they are taken out, and then putting in men beyond the draft age. Men that will be put in will be beyond the draft age, and this will only give us one school of development, whereas by the present system there are continual changes. The first six months of this work, as you all know, is practically given to the man until he learns it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, let us see how much more debate is wanted. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the expiration of 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the expiration of 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I was surprised, if not dumfounded, when the statement was made here that the Secretary of Agriculture had asked for 2,000 exemptions in his department. Two thousand exemptions in his department! Now, there is but one way, as far as we possibly can, to play this war game, and that is to play it on the absolute square. [Applause.]

When the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other Secretary, goes on record asking for 2,000 exemptions in his department, pray, tell us what his department would do if that 2,000 should fall dead overnight? Would it go to pieces like a rag? This is unfair; manifestly so. No one man's services are indispensable to a success in the war, and no 2,000 men's services in any branch of the Government are indispensable; and it is unfair to ask for their exemption.

I have not much confidence, anyhow, in these men traipsing around over the country, but I will tell you who I have got confidence in, and that is the practical farmer—the man that knows how to plant and when to plant; how to plow and when to plow; how to sow and when to sow; how to reap and when to mow. There is a young farmer in my district who lives close to me. I know him, I know his father, and I know his family. I have been upon his farm twenty times or more. He is the only boy on that farm, and the local board put him in class 4. Then the district board put him in E class 1. It is nothing to me. The fact that he was improperly placed or reclassified was brought to my attention. I went to see Gen. Crowder and was informed that there was not one chance in a thousand to have that boy put back in class 4. It is nothing to me, but the result will be that that farmer will have a public sale in a few days, because he can not hire labor. He can not get it for love or money. It is not a question of price, and so the result will be a public sale. I am not complaining, I am not criticizing anybody, but that is the condition and not a theory. There is a boy that has raised oceans of stuff—wheat, rye, corn, barley, hogs, cattle, everything that grows in my country. He was put in class 4 by the local board, reclassified by the district board, and now he is up against the call soon to go into the service. He could not get exemption; his classification was even changed. He is a practical man; a farmer from the ground up; a graduate of the school of farming experience; and yet the Secretary of Agriculture has asked, according to the statement made here to-day, for the exemption of 2,000 persons in his department. I take it that the vast majority of them are theoretical men, men that never plowed in their lives, never put up a shock of wheat, never stood on a straw stack and stacked straw, but men that are supposed to go out and tell the farmer how to produce more crops; how to make his farm a success. Here is a farmer who has made his farm a success, and here is the statement that the Secretary of Agriculture has made, that 2,000 of these men going around over the country telling the old farmer how to produce more stuff should be exempted. Why does not the Agricultural Committee accept this amendment without debate? Every man on it should vote for it to go on this bill. I propose to vote for it myself. [Applause.] Some of the departments are taking in men of draft age to-day. A young man found his way into my office last week who, 22 years of age and in class 1, a single man, got in the civil service and got a job here—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

By unanimous consent Mr. Cox was granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. Chairman, there are 20,000 men and women employed in the Agricultural Department. I do not know how many of those are women, but assuming that they are all men we have here the record of the statement to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for the exemption of 1 man out of every 10 in his department from military service. Do you believe in this sort of practice? If not, then here is a remedy. The adoption of this amendment simply means that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not employ in these activities any man who is within the draft age. Are there men beyond the draft age who are qualified to perform this kind of work? I would hate to think there are not. Then, if there are, why not employ them? Why give the Secretary of Agriculture or any other man the power to employ men and thereby relieve them from military service? We are engaged in a great war in which every man, woman, and child in America is interested. Shall we say that those who are employed in the Agricultural Department are to be exempt from military duty? I hope not. There can be no question about the wisdom of the

adoption of the amendment that is pending. What does it do? It simply directs the Secretary of Agriculture that under no circumstances must he employ and thereby relieve from military duty anybody within the draft age. It serves notice upon him that for every man needed in these activities he must find a man beyond the draft age. Is that any evidence of distrust of the Secretary of Agriculture? Not at all.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is not this the fact: That in the recent draft bill which the House passed we put all of the students of divinity and medicine hereafter in the Army and prevented them from stacking up in medical and divinity schools?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and the House was most emphatic upon that question.

Mr. COX. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. Why place the Secretary of Agriculture upon a pedestal above criticism? Why say that he alone shall have the power to exempt men from military service? Why compel the widow whose only boy, is needed at home to send him to the front to fight for America, to send that boy and then permit the Secretary of Agriculture to employ men whom he can exempt from military service? Why not say to the Secretary of Agriculture that no man under 31 years of age shall be given employment under this act? Why not say that no person under 31 years of age shall be paid from this appropriation? That is what the amendment says. That is what it does. It seeks not to amend the draft act, not at all. It simply places a limitation on the expenditure of this \$6,100,000. Is it just to place such a limitation upon it? Shall we say to the widows of America, your boy is without influence and shall be sent to the front to fight, while boys within the draft age who have influence enough to get upon the Agricultural pay rolls shall be hidden away in a safe place beyond the danger of the firing line? Gentlemen, do it if you will; but you can not do it with my vote. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, one of the principles upon which our Government was established and founded, at the very threshold, was that all men are created equal in the eyes of the law. I look around this Chamber, and I see your boy, and yours, and your two boys in the Army, and I think they are just as good as those boys who would be exempt from the draft under this bill providing they secured employment in the Agricultural Department. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, making everyone within the draft age liable for military duty ought to prevail and not allow exemption because employed in any department.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman not remember that when the food-control bill was under consideration last year the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who had charge of it, accepted an amendment almost identical in language with this?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think that is true, and I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. If we are going to raise an army, let us have an army of enlisted men ready for military duty. If it is generally understood that there is to be a haven where men can get civil employment from the Government and be exempted from military duty, it will have a bad effect upon the morale not only of the Army, but of the people at home. It will cause ridicule, and it will have a bad effect on the boys now in the service. This bill is all right, but it needs a few amendments. I wish they could amend the report of the committee where it says that certain thousands of dollars are to be employed in locating Irish potatoes. That should be amended by adding the words "in Michigan" after the word potatoes, because there is such a superabundance of Irish potatoes from last year's crop up in Michigan that it has all Ireland staggered.

Mr. MADDEN. The farmers are selling potatoes now at 60 cents a bushel on the market and have to pay the freight out of that 60 cents.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is true. This whole country should prepare for fighting first, last, and all the time. If they are looking for more men to do the harvesting with this \$500,000, they might step over to the Labor Department and take a peep at the list of 300,000 laborers that is there, and they may find them in that institution, which is employing the activities of the Post Office in getting laborers and workmen. There are 10,000,000 men in this country within the draft age. That leaves 90,000,000 outside. Is anyone going to say that there can not be procured enough men from the 90,000,000 to run the Agricultural Department for the farmers? Why, of course, they can get them. The Government takes the best experts in the country—all kinds of engineers, college men, mechanics, machinists, architects, bankers, and I was going to say lawyers—

and puts them in the Army, and I think Government employees ought not to be exempted. [Applause.] Let us not exempt them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

First. For the prevention, control, and eradication of the diseases and pests of live stock; the enlargement of live-stock production, and the conservation and utilization of meat, poultry, dairy, and other animal products, \$1,058,975.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "first," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert the following:

"For the prevention, control, and eradication of cattle ticks, \$61,610; of hog cholera, \$202,965; of abortion, influenza, strangles, etc., \$175,000; for the production of beef cattle, \$105,000; for live-stock production in the great plains region, \$100,000; for the production of pork, \$150,000; for the production of poultry, \$129,600; for the production of sheep, \$60,000; for the making of cottage cheese on the farms, \$52,950; for the utilization of creamery by-products, \$21,850."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has exactly the same aggregate as the section provided in the bill. The object of the amendment is to itemize it. The committee spent a considerable time, and on four items in this section there was a reduction of \$210,680. The first was the eradication of cattle ticks, and the estimate asked was \$191,190, and we reduced it to \$61,610. The next was the production of poultry, and the estimate was \$168,000, and we reduced it to \$129,600. The third was making of cottage cheese on the farm, \$80,000, and we reduced it to \$52,950. The fourth was \$37,500, and we reduced it to \$21,850. The total, as I said, is the same amount as in the bill. My object in introducing the amendment is to itemize it. This gives power to the Secretary of Agriculture to spend all of this amount on any one item. My idea of it is that our work is useless if they can spend it all on one item, and it ought to be specified, so that each item would get their proper share. One item, for instance, the making of cottage cheese on the farm, \$80,000, an article in common use, was cut down to \$52,950, one of the most useless things that the Department of Agriculture can do, because the average woman on the farm knows how to make cottage cheese. In fact, I could give in four or five words the recipe that will do the work which this \$52,950 will do. This bill, I think, ought to be itemized in this section and all the others, so that we will know what we are voting for. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. COX. If I understood the gentleman's amendment, it strikes out all of paragraph 1, which carries an appropriation of \$1,058,975, and inserts in lieu thereof—

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Ten items, amounting to the same amount.

Mr. COX. I have not had time to foot up the appropriation carried in the gentleman's amendment, but does it foot up the same thing?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Exactly the same amount. It is only itemized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey, it purposes to carry out the conclusion of the committee in the amount of money that they should award for the respective purposes enumerated in this item, which is lumped in one amount under general phraseology in the bill reported by the committee. If there is one thing for which the Congress has been contending for a long time it is to try and have control of the expenditures of the respective activities in the departments, but the proposal of the committee would grant the head of a department carte blanche to use any amount that he saw fit up to \$1,058,000. For instance, the full amount could be used for what I regard as a foolish and fantastic experimentation with respect to the making of cottage cheese on the farm; especially in these times is it rather fantastic, as any person who knows anything about schmierkase ought to know that there is no necessity even to spend \$52,950.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Another advantage of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey is that if the House wishes to eliminate and strike out some of these appropriations for these respective items it would be privileged to do so, but when you read the general item reported by the majority of

the committee no one can find there such a scientific investigation as the making of cottage cheese on the farm—

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman inform the committee in all seriousness how that item of \$52,950 is to be expended—by employing people to travel over the country or publication of pamphlets or what?

Mr. HAUGEN. They are going to send men to each county, in each State, to teach the farm wife how to make cottage cheese.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa and let him explain what this really scientific work consists of in these stressful times of war.

Mr. COX. The first thing I ever knew was of my mother making cottage cheese.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman can go ahead in his own time, and I will take time later.

Mr. STAFFORD. At the request of the gentleman from Iowa, I shall proceed. Mr. Chairman, especially in these times when we are pressed for revenue, especially in these times when we should scrutinize with care the expenditures of the departments which are not engaged in war activities, should this Congress adopt a policy of segregation of items rather than the policy of lump-sum proposals, especially as reported in this bill when the amounts run up into the millions of dollars.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that with all of these items covered in one lump sum there is no way of getting at any indefensible item like the making of cottage cheese, and that is probably why it is put in that way?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know what the motive of the members of the committee may have been in recommending it in this omnibus form, but certainly the House can not determine as to whether it should exercise its prerogative in allowing certain activities to continue or not. We have the right to determine how much should be expended for these various activities. If we want to increase the appropriation for the eradication of cattle tick, we should do it. If we wish to strike out the appropriation for that fanciful latter-day creation of a survey and investigation of cottage cheese on the farm, we should do it. Then there is the other provision, which was included in the omnibus bill, of utilization of dairy products, \$21,050. That may be an activity which the members of the committee can inform the House as to whether it is desired or not. In the form submitted by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] it is left to the House to determine whether the respective appropriations for these segregated items should continue or not.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question of the gentleman from Ohio, I desire to read from Mr. Rawl's statement before the committee, which appears on page 27. It says:

The CHAIRMAN. Your first item, Mr. Rawl, is No. 9, on page 8, "Making cottage cheese on the farm." The allotment for 1918 was \$52,950, and the estimate in this bill is \$80,000, which is an increase of \$27,500.

And he says, among other things:

The experience of the department during the present fiscal year clearly indicates the desirability of carrying on an active campaign for the purpose of encouraging the making and consuming of cottage cheese. With the emergency funds available this year an agent will be assigned to each State to demonstrate proper methods of making cottage cheese and to give definite information regarding its use.

I would like to read the gentleman's testimony given a year ago, as follows:

I believe if you go into a county and teach the domestic-science agent how to make cottage cheese, and how to make it on the farm—

Experts are to be sent into the States to teach the Government employees how to make cottage cheese, they in turn to teach the farmer's wife. Now, I believe it is safe to say that there is hardly a 12-year-old girl on a farm that does not know how to make cottage cheese. All there is to it is to put a little clabbered milk in a cheese cloth, hang it up overnight, and add a little salt to it in the morning; and if butter and cream is added it improves its quality. That is all there is to it. And we are here proposing to send men out at the rate of \$2,500 a year to show Government employees in the country how to make cottage cheese—\$80,000 was suggested in addition to the appropriation made in the annual appropriation bill. Here is the process, and it is an interesting one. Dr. Rawl said:

And if that agent goes back the next week and gives two or three more demonstrations, and the next week does the same thing—

And so on.

He believes the farmer's wife can be taught to make and made to eat cottage cheese.

What a wonderful process, gentlemen!

Mr. COX. Are these agents who are trooping around for this purpose, men or women?

Mr. HAUGEN. I presume both; I do not know what they are.

Mr. COX. What salaries do they draw?

Mr. HAUGEN. They draw from \$100 to \$300 a month. There is no limitation in many salaries fixed by the Department of Agriculture. Many are scientists, and the only limitation is the \$3,500.

Mr. COX. If there is a woman on the farm in all this broad land who does not know how to make cottage cheese, could not that information be carried to her in a bulletin?

Mr. HAUGEN. It does not have to be carried in a bulletin. Every housewife knows how to make cottage cheese.

Mr. COX. They had better move to the cities.

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, everybody in the cities knows how to make cottage cheese, as well as those on the farm. It is a very useful food product.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all I desire to say, and I believe it is clear to everybody, is that this bill should not be passed in the form in which it is drawn, and the only practical way of doing business would be to send it back to the committee with instructions to have this bill reported as the bill should be reported and as committees have been instructed from time to time to report bills, and that is, that every item should be segregated in order that Congress may know something about how this money is to be appropriated.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to ask the gentleman and also the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] why it is that that suggestion was not made by you or by him in the committee? There was no man in the committee that made any suggestion of that kind whatever, to my knowledge.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WASON. I would like to know if it is proper in here to bring in the doings of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The question of what passed in the committee properly ought not to be brought in here. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

Mr. RUBEY. Are you ashamed of what occurred in the committee?

Mr. WASON. It is not a question of whether I am ashamed of the gentleman from Missouri or not. It is a question of keeping within the rules.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. As stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], if there ever was a bill contested in that committee it was this bill, from beginning to end; but, as the gentleman knows, the bill was reported; that there was an effort made to cut down many of the amounts carried in the bill and to have it reported in a regular way in which appropriation bills are generally reported. It is a matter that ought to be sent back to the committee and the items segregated. The department and the Congress ought to know just how and where this money is to be expended. Under the present form the whole amount, \$1,058,975, can be used for the purpose of encouraging the making and consuming of cottage cheese, for the employment of agents, which seems an absurd and unbusinesslike way of making appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall terminate in 15 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I modify the motion and ask for 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman modifies the request and instead of 15 minutes asks for 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That includes five minutes for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Somebody told me just now that we were to vote at 5 o'clock. Do you expect to use all the time up to then?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The vote at 5 o'clock is on another bill. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now, will the gentleman from Mississippi indicate the gentlemen who are to occupy this time?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] asks for five minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] five minutes, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] five minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] five, and I want five.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BURNETT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries announced that the President had, on May 20, 1918, approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 11245. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917;

S. 3771. An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approval May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

FOOD PRODUCTION.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this bill in its present form is utterly and absolutely indefensible. There is not any defense that can be made for bringing in a bill carrying over \$11,000,000 in lump sums, the intention of which, it is admitted, is to scatter it around among a large number of items, as to which not a man in the House has any information except what has been given by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

It is not alone this absurd and ridiculous proposition of appropriating \$80,000 for disseminating information as to making cottage cheese. And right here I want to warn any agents who propose giving information on that subject from going into the houses of any Iowa farmers and attempting to give instruction to the housewives along that line. They will probably be instructed in something themselves, if they undertake it. [Laughter.]

There are others of these items that ought to be cut down or entirely eliminated. But there is no way by which it can be done, because of the peculiar manner in which this bill is brought in. The last Agricultural appropriation bill carried an item of \$460,000 for the elimination of hog cholera. Now, they want \$200,000 or \$300,000 more, as we are informed by the gentleman from New Jersey, for the elimination of hog cholera, when they would have to search in order to find the hog cholera existing in this country at this time, because hog cholera, as everyone conversant with that disease knows, goes by cycles. This is one of the particular times when it is not prevalent and it is not necessary to have so large appropriations to use at present.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that the appropriations heretofore for that purpose have been well used and that the disease has been stamped out?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it likely. At all events, the disease is not very prevalent at this time.

No showing can be made as to why the amount should be increased at this time, or why we should have a larger sum now for the extermination of the cattle tick. Has not the sum heretofore appropriated been found sufficient?

Why, in Heaven's name, should we be appropriating money for the distribution of laborers or obtaining farm labor when the Department of Labor has a complete plan on an elaborate scale to distribute and supply laborers? Why should we duplicate this? I find from the tables presented by the gentleman from New Jersey that they even want something like \$20,000 or \$30,000 for promoting the culture of the castor bean. Gentlemen of the House, we have learned about the failure of the airplane program; we have learned from the voluminous report that they had submitted that they had made no fighting airplanes, but they made much of the fact that they had provided for the culture of castor beans. Now, it seems it was

not in such a way but that the Department of Agriculture finds it necessary to spend more money for the same purpose. [Laughter.] You can go into every supposed item included in this bill and find some reason why it should be cut down or entirely eliminated.

What do we want with two county agents in each county? Why is not one enough? Of course, some gentleman will say, "You do not know that this is for two county agents." That is just the trouble. We do not know how this money is going to be expended, or what it is going to be expended for. We have no justification whatever for the bill in its present form. We do not know where to cut it; we do not know how to reach the objectionable items. In short, we know nothing about the bill, except that it ought to be recommitted to the committee and brought forth in proper form, so that we can tell something about it.

Mr. Chairman, how long are we to go along in this way, facing a situation where we are expected to raise \$30,000,000,000 for the next year, and when we come in with a bill carrying \$18,000,000 have some one say, "We do not know what these items are, but we think they are all right. The Secretary of Agriculture wants the money." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I have a minute more, or does the limitation of time prevent?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma). The time has been allotted.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Otherwise I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The time was allotted by unanimous consent. The gentleman was given 5 minutes out of the 25.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can get time by unanimous consent.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out \$52,950 and insert in lieu thereof \$25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox to the amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Strike out the figures "\$52,950" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], adopted a little while ago, materially strengthened the bill, in my opinion, and makes it a much better bill than it was when it was brought into the House. The amendment now before us, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON], ought to be adopted. It ought to have the unanimous support of every member of the committee.

This bill, gentlemen, furnishes an unanswerable argument as to the necessity of a budget committee in the House. One department is duplicating another. One department is asking an appropriation for a certain kind of work, and another department is asking an appropriation for the same kind of work. I think before we get through with this war we shall certainly get a budget committee, a Committee on Appropriations combined with a revenue committee, the two going hand in hand to raise the revenue and make the appropriations.

Now, unless the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey is adopted, as the argument has been well made here, there will be no limitation on the amount that can be expended on any one item in this bill; not at all. They can spend the entire \$11,000,000 for any item they want.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think this entire appropriation could be used for the cottage-cheese investigation?

Mr. COX. I am going to discuss that in a moment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Has the gentleman any idea in the world that it would be used for any such purpose?

Mr. COX. I have no idea, but I would just as soon trust the judgment of Congress as to trust the judgment of any Cabinet officer when it comes to spending money.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Does the gentleman believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would squander the money in that way?

Mr. COX. No; I do not think he would recklessly squander the money. I presume he would be economical in its expenditure, although I would prefer the judgment of this Congress to limit his ability and permit him to spend only so much on each item. But the idea of spending \$52,000 to teach the women of this country how to make cottage cheese is astounding; the

idea of appropriating \$52,000 to employ men and women to travel about through the rural communities telling farmers' wives how to make cottage cheese is absurd, preposterous, unbelievable, if not unthinkable, in time of war or in time of peace. Why, the first food commodity that I distinctly recollect my mother having made was cottage cheese. Forty-five or forty-eight years ago, I remember it well, and that was almost before we even had the Agricultural Department or even a bureau of it. Now, there might be some sense in using this money in some sections of the country where farmers' wives do not know how to make cottage cheese, but I do not know where those sections are. You will find the wives of the farmers in the North that can throw a ring around these people who go out and try to teach them how to make cottage cheese. You can find farmers' wives in the North who can make these people look like 30 cents with a hole in it in this line of work. I do not care if these people who go out are college graduates, because the old woman on the farm is a graduate, too, although she has not worn out her back in sitting in colleges, but she has worn it out in the school of experience in learning how to produce things.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Not just now. It may be that the department might need a little appropriation here for the publication of bulletins or circulars or something of that kind that could be sent through the mails, distributed among the women, if there be any in the country that do not know how to make cottage cheese, and tell them all about it. I think my amendment ought to carry. It only saves, it is true, \$25,000.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HERSEY. Has the gentleman understood that it was the purpose to ship cottage cheese to the soldiers in France?

Mr. COX. I do not know anything about that. If it is, this thing would not tell the farmers' wives anything more than they already know about it. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, one of the peculiarities in this body is that whenever a bill is brought before the committee recommending a comparatively small appropriation for anything touching agriculture there is always raised a tremendous howl against it. I have seen pension bills carrying \$150,000,000 pass this body without 10 minutes of debate. I have seen the Post Office appropriation bill, carrying over \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000 pass practically without discussion. I have seen the great naval bill take the same course. I suspect that in a few days we will have the Army appropriation bill, carrying not millions but billions; and there will not be a single little chirp about it from those gentlemen who are so solicitous of the funds in the Treasury. It is only when the Agricultural Committee comes in that the watchdogs from certain large committees in this House who would like to control all the appropriations that Congress makes get into action and get busy. I have seen it take place here for many, many years. I see the evidences of it again this afternoon. I assume that we shall see more evidences of it on to-morrow and the next day, and as long as this bill is under consideration.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I have only five minutes which was graciously yielded to me by the gentleman from Mississippi. This bill prepared by the Committee on Agriculture now in charge of the energetic and active gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is not an unusual piece of legislation. It is following the exact lines verbatim of the food-production act which passed this body last year and became an act of Congress by the signature of the President on the 10th of August, 1917.

It might have been better to have segregated these items. It has been the policy of the Committee on Agriculture, in dealing with the regular appropriation bill, to segregate the items as far as possible. This committee in making up this bill, however, has followed the dictates of Congress itself in lumping the funds into several general items.

My friend from Indiana [Mr. Cox] raised a good deal of smoke about that fact, that we are appropriating a small fund here for the encouragement and the production of cottage cheese. I want to say to the gentleman that my old grandmother—my mother having died when I was a baby—also knew how to make cottage cheese. We called it clabber cheese in my country. There are thousands and thousands of women in this country to-day, country women, who know how to make it. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana on that, but they have not had impressed upon them the importance of making cottage cheese to use as a substitute for meat. That is the purpose of this appropriation. There is hardly a rural woman in the United States who does not know how to make cottage cheese, but there

are tens of thousands who have not had it brought to their attention that by utilizing the milk, much of which is wasted on the farm, they can save meat that can be sent to our boys who are dying in the trenches across the water. That is the purpose of the \$52,000 appropriated in this bill. Is that good work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that the appropriation of \$52,000 was to stimulate the commercial production of cottage cheese and to utilize the by-products of the creamery?

Mr. LEVER. Both. One is to encourage production of cottage cheese among the rural women and the other is to encourage utilization of by-products of the creamery in order that we may save meat; and it is a better proposition than gentlemen think it is, after all. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think this item in the bill should be separated into its proper parts by the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey. If this bill should pass in its present form, the Secretary of Agriculture will not know how much money has been appropriated for the several lines of work, because the bill carries no information. He will be permitted to expend it all for one thing to the exclusion of all others. It will only be by going and looking over the minutes of the Committee on Agriculture that he can determine how much money was intended for each of the several items. We reduced one item \$129,000. We have reduced others. We increased some. What information has the Secretary of Agriculture as to how much money was allowed for any particular thing? What would he do in spending the money? How much would he know had been allowed by Congress?

The will of Congress should control the Secretary of Agriculture, although, if we take the word of the gentleman from Mississippi, a suggestion from Congress to the Secretary is a reflection upon him. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] asks why it was necessary to employ two county agents in a county. Under this bill, if it should be enacted into law, provision is made for sending not alone two, but four or five or a half-dozen agents into a county. Over and over again I have asked gentlemen representing the department appearing before the committee why it is necessary to have one man go to talk with a farmer about his beef cattle, and another to go to talk about poultry, and still another go and talk about sheep production, and a fourth man go and talk about diseases of hogs or about the increase in the production of them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. On dairy work also.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And as to dairy work, yes; and the reply of each one of these gentlemen was that each man was an expert in his line, that it takes an expert, and that a man can be an expert in only one line of work. The result is that these automobiles we are supplying will be filled with a half dozen of these agents and representatives of the Department of Agriculture going to and fro, going in a bunch to a farm, each "expert" to talk to the farmer about a particular line of work. That is a legitimate criticism of this bill and of some of the work it provides for. That objection has been made in committee over and over again, and argument made against the employment of so many men, but the argument fell upon deaf ears, and this bill comes in its present form. My statement respecting these matters is not overdrawn; it is in no respect a misstatement or an exaggeration. I have made that objection, and I have called it to the attention of the heads of the bureaus and of the Secretary of Agriculture himself more than once. Time and time again when they came before the committee I asked why it was necessary to have two, three, four, and five men employed to go to a farm, each one to talk about a particular line of work, all work that one man, if he is fit to hold the humblest of these positions, ought to know all about, and the answer is that it is expert work, and that therefore all of these men must be employed.

In case there is danger of these "experts" crowding the inhabitants or themselves in small towns, or if their joint visit to a farm is liable to interfere with the farmer or inconvenience the men themselves they are advised, I presume, to hold a convention before entering the town and arrange a schedule of operations.

Mr. LA FOLLETE. Was any suggestion ever made that they go in the wintertime so as to give the farmer a little chance to do some real work?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is a suggestion by some one that they go in war time, when they can be exempt from active military service, but this House in its wisdom has prevented that. It is absolutely necessary, if we are to give any direction whatever to the Secretary of Agriculture as to the expenditure of a sum of more than \$2,000,000, if the will of Con-

gress is to be expressed in any form as to the manner in which this fund shall be used, that the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] be adopted.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order on this amendment, and I ask the Chairman to rule upon it. This bill is in the language of the food-production act passed at the last session of Congress. This item is in identically the language of that bill. The item reads as follows:

For the prevention, control, and eradication of the diseases and pests of live stock; the enlargement of live-stock production, and the conservation and utilization of meat, poultry, dairy, and other animal products, \$1,058,975.

This bill is simply making an appropriation to carry on that work. That was the work that was authorized at the last session by that law. To divide it up, to itemize it, and chop it to pieces would be a change of that law, and it seems to me that it is subject to a point of order on the ground that it changes existing law. Furthermore, the amendment offered by the gentleman in the form in which he offers it is not germane to this section. I submit that to the Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the effect of the amendment in the nature of a limitation as to how much of the appropriation may be used for certain specified purposes, all of which are within the purview of the act?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; I do not think it would be a limitation. It is a specific direction as to how it shall be expended—that he shall expend so many dollars, no more and no less, for a specific purpose.

Mr. WALSH. If it says \$52,000 for cottage cheese, it certainly limits the amount that can be used for that purpose.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It limits the amount to that particular item, but it is a direction that not one cent more can be expended for this or that.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman is opposed to that?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am in favor of giving the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion in reference to the expenditure of sums for various items, just like was given under the food-production act a year ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, unless the Chair is ready to rule, I desire to say a word or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The logic of the position of the gentleman having the bill in charge is that the House must appropriate for every item of expenditure as carried in general language in the food act of August 10, 1917. I grant that the language of the paragraph under consideration, which the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey seeks to strike out, is in the identical language carried in the original food act, but I do not grant that Congress has not the right in voting the appropriation to determine how much money shall be voted for the respective purposes. Congress has the authority to refuse to vote the money for these respective purposes. If it has authority to refuse to appropriate, it also has authority to segregate and designate the respective character and the extent of service which come within the generic language as included in the original food-survey law. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the language of the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey does not contain one item of activity that can not be included within the general phraseology of the bill as reported from the committee. Certainly this Congress is not limited to the phraseology of the act of a year ago. It may be limited as to the purposes which were included in the general language in that authority of a year ago. Congress has the right at all times to appropriate or to refuse to appropriate, and it has the further right now, without changing the existing law, to designate specifically the activities and functions for which these appropriations will be made. If the Chair will study the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey he will see that there is not an item there included that is not covered under the general phraseology of the item as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been looking over this amendment pending the debate. I believe it is agreed that the language of the paragraph proposed to be replaced is the language of existing law, and that it provides in a large way, and in general terms for extensive activities on the part of the Agricultural Department. Looking to the proposed amendment the Chair does not note that in its enumeration of activities there is a single one that is not possible for the Agricultural Department to set on foot and pursue under the general authority of the existing law. A fixed amount is proposed by the amendment for each of the enumerated activities. Whatever Congress is empowered to appropriate for, it can refuse to appropriate for, and in the exercise of this power to deny any appro-

priation whatsoever, it can appropriate for a limited extent only. This being so, it can fix this limited appropriation at whatever amount it deems to be fair and just. Its judgment on that matter is final and conclusive. This amendment enumerates certain activities which the Agricultural Department is empowered to set in motion, as and with respect to these activities, it fixes the amounts that may be expended thereon. If the amendment is adopted, it is in substance a declaration by Congress that, under this particular head, the activities indicated, are the only activities for which it is willing to appropriate. Should Congress choose to exercise its authority to award, or deny an appropriation, for an authorized purpose, by appropriating for one, or more items falling within that purpose, and refusing it to others, who is there to say it nay, and in fact in principle who should say it nay? It is a reasonable exercise of a power that belongs to, and ought to belong to, and remain with the Congress. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think I have five minutes remaining. I desire to call attention to the fact that this bill as reported by the committee is exactly in accordance with the food-production bill which was reported a year ago, which was approved by Congress by a vote that was almost unanimous. There were 365 votes for that bill and only 5 votes against the bill in identically the same language that you will find in this bill making lump-sum appropriations just exactly as made in this bill, and without any change whatever from the language of that bill this bill was reported by the direct authority and under the direction of the Committee on Agriculture. There was no objection expressed in committee to reporting the bill in this form, but on the contrary I was directed by a unanimous vote of those present and voting in committee to report it in this form.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have but five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. For just a question.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. All right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that last year this was the initial legislation along this line. Congress did not put a restriction upon the department's activities, but now there are specific recommendations that have been made, so why should it not limit the authority in the way proposed by the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It was new legislation at the last session of Congress, and Congress passed the law in this identical form and put the fund in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and thereby charged him with the responsibility of administering it, and the Secretary of Agriculture has kept it absolutely under his own personal control. None of it has been expended and none has been allotted to a single bureau or a single division of the Department of Agriculture except by the Secretary himself, and the bureau chiefs or division chiefs or the other employees in the Agricultural Department who have expended any part of it have had to go to him every time and submit their proposition to him and secure his approval of it and then get from him an allotment out of the fund for the activities they proposed to undertake.

Now, that having been the policy before, the Secretary of Agriculture is better qualified now by experience, and his department is better qualified by experience and investigations which they have made, to carry out the provisions of this law under the lump-sum appropriation and general legislation as provided in this bill than they were a year ago. Why change the whole plan of legislation and take the discretion away from the Secretary of Agriculture in these war times when emergencies frequently arise and say to him, "You can spend a thousand dollars on this matter and a thousand dollars on that, but you shall not spend \$999 for this and you shall not spend \$1,001 for the other." I have absolute confidence in the Secretary, in his good judgment and patriotism, to give him this discretion to spend this money to get the best results, and therefore I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. Pass the law as it is, and put the money in the hands of the Secretary. It is true that the department says this is the manner in which they propose to use it, specifying the items; and each item was fully considered by the committee and a full hearing was had. Then after the full hearing was completed, then each and every item was taken up, each and every item was considered by the full committee—not a subcommittee—and each and every item was passed by the committee, and the total amount included in each and every section in the bill as reported by the committee by the specific direction of the committee is the total amount of the items passed upon and approved by the members of the committee to make up the several amounts in each section of the bill as reported to the House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There was a reduction of \$210,680 from the estimate of the Secretary. If this bill passes in its present form, how will he know from which items the deductions were made?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The report shows the reductions made.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Secretary will have to look at the report?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Each item shows for itself.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman admits it will be necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to go to the report of the committee, does he?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It will not be necessary for him to go to the report of the committee. When he is given the lump sum he might not allot the same amount; he might reduce or increase it to meet emergencies, and I favor giving him that discretion. He will know the amount available and he will allot it to secure best results.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman did proceed on the theory he was not recommending an amount beyond what he should use.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman is proceeding upon the theory that the amount which the committee approved was a sufficient amount to be used for the purposes indicated in the provisions of the bill. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Also the amendment to the amendment was read.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MADDEN. To oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MEEKER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 35, noes 40.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey demands tellers.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the request for tellers.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 40.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey demands tellers. All who are in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted.

The Chair proceeded to count.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Crago	Fairchild, G. W.	Greene, Vt.
Beshlin	Crosser	Farr	Griest
Brodbeck	Currie, Mich.	Fields	Griffin
Butler	Curry, Cal.	Flood	Hamill
Byrnes, S. C.	Dale, N. Y.	Flynn	Hamilton, Mich.
Caldwell	Darrow	Focht	Hamilton, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Davidson	Foster	Harrison, Miss.
Cantrill	Davis	Freeman	Haskell
Caraway	Dempsey	Fuller, Ill.	Hayes
Carew	Dent	Fuller, Mass.	Heaton
Carlin	Dewalt	Gallivan	Hefflin
Carter, Mass.	Dies	Gard	Heintz
Carter, Okla.	Dillon	Garland	Hicks
Chandler, N. Y.	Donovan	Glynn	Hilliard
Church	Dooling	Godwin, N. C.	Hood
Clark, Fla.	Drukker	Gordon	Howard
Clark, Pa.	Dunn	Gould	Humphreys
Connelly, Kans.	Edmonds	Graham, Pa.	Husted
Copley	Estopinal	Gray, Ala.	Jacoway
Costello		Gray, N. J.	James

Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Kahn
Kearns
Kehoe
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kettner
Key, Ohio
Kiess, Pa.
Kreider
LaGuardia
Langley
Leshar
Little
Longworth
Lufkin
Lunn
McFadden
McKenzie
McKinley
McLaughlin, Pa.

Maher
Mann
Martin
Mason
Merritt
Miller, Minn.
Montague
Moore, Pa.
Morin
Mudd
Nichols, Mich.
Norton
Oldfield
Olney
Overmyer
Paige
Parker, N. Y.
Porter
Powers
Pratt
Price
Ramsey

Rankin
Riordan
Robbins
Rose
Rowe
Rowland
Rucker
Sabath
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, La.
Sanford
Scott, Mich.
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Sears
Sells
Sherley
Sisson
Sloan
Small
Smith, T. F.
Snell

Snook
Snyder
Steele
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Pa.
Strong
Sullivan
Swift
Tague
Templeton
Tilson
Vare
Voigt
Ward
Watson, Pa.
Webb
Williams
Wilson, La.
Winslow
Wise
Woods, Iowa

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 11945, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, and that he presented therewith the names of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and the Record.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixty-three Members, a quorum, are present.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] will take their places as tellers.

Mr. WALSH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. The House having by previous order decided that at 5 o'clock the committee should rise and proceed to a matter under the suspension of the rules, I desire to ask that if the hour of 5 o'clock arrives while the Members are passing through the tellers, the committee would have to rise before completing the vote; or would it be completed?

The CHAIRMAN. If the point is insisted on now, the Chair will rule on it.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point that the hour of 5 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point that it has not, by this clock over here.

Mr. WINGO. As a matter of fact, the House did not make any order at all. They agreed it would be in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I believe that by consulting the Record of Saturday it will be found that in the discussion it depended on when the committee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. It is purely a technical proposition.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] will take their places as tellers. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 92, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," and had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS TO THE AMERICAN RED CROSS.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move to take from the Speaker's desk Senate bill 3911, authorizing the national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross, and move to suspend the rules and pass it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the Senate bill 3911 be taken from the Speaker's stand and the rules suspended and the bill passed, and the gentleman from Illinois demands a second.

Mr. GLASS. I ask that the second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois 20.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent, the motion having been made, to see if we can not get more than 20 minutes to a side. It is a very important proposition. I think we ought to have at least 40 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that the debate shall be 40 minutes to a side. Is there objection?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, this is a self-evident proposition. It does not require a great deal of explanation, if any at all. The Members may very definitely or quickly determine whether they want to vote for it or against it, and I hope the gentleman will not suggest an extension of the time. Twenty minutes on a side, it seems to me, will be ample. Twenty minutes is more than I shall want on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GLASS. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 20 minutes. The Clerk will report the bill.

The clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3911) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross.

Be it enacted, etc., That during the continuance of the state of war now existing it shall be lawful for any national banking association to contribute to the American National Red Cross, out of any net profits otherwise available under the law for the declaration of dividends, such sum or sums as the directors of said association shall deem expedient. Each association shall report to the Comptroller of the Currency within 10 days after the making of any such contribution the amount of such contribution and the amount of net earnings in excess of such contribution. Such report shall be attested by the president or cashier of the association in like manner as the report of the declaration of any dividend.

Sec. 2. That all sums so contributed shall be utilized by the American National Red Cross in furnishing volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of the combatant armies, the voluntary relief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and the relief and mitigation of the suffering caused by the war to people of the United States and their allied nations.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with the bill reported from the House Committee on Banking and Currency, now on the calendar. It is a perfectly self-evident proposition and requires scarcely any explanation. Ordinarily I would not favor such a bill; but in the circumstances it is a war measure, if there ever was a war measure. The bill explicitly provides that the permission granted to national banks to subscribe to the American Red Cross fund shall be only for the duration of the war.

It is needless to remind the House that the Red Cross is a non-sectarian organization. It recognizes no creed, no religion. It is merciful and humanitarian altogether in its conceptions, its functions, and activities. Anybody may belong to it; anybody may contribute to its funds and help in its work, Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, white or black, Christian or pagan. It is universal in its purpose, its scope, and activities.

I would like to draw the attention of the House for a moment to an extract from a letter by Mr. Henry P. Davison, written on the day before yesterday. Mr. Davison has just returned from the battle front, and he says:

The outstanding feature of the German method at the present time is the effort to terrorize the women, children, and old men at home. While the German troops are making their drive on the front airplanes are bombing, nearly every night, towns behind the lines, with the deliberate and declared purpose of terrorizing civilians.

The purpose of the fight behind the line is to break down the morale of the civilian population to such a point that they will importune their governments for peace. It is the most dastardly, unrighteous, cruel, devilish plan which could be conceived. It is based upon the theory that the killing of four children out of five will induce the mother to implore her government to have the war stopped, that her fifth child may live. It is carried on from the English Channel to the Swiss border and from the Swiss border to the Adriatic, and has resulted in the murder and maiming of thousands of women and children and the driving of hundreds of thousands of terror-stricken from their homes to wherever they might seek refuge.

The people in Europe were simply astounded at the news of the American Red Cross having attained a membership of 23,000,000 adults. We shall need money, and we shall need workers, more and more; and we need always to let it be known to our soldiers and the soldiers of our allies and the peoples behind their lines over in the war zone itself, that the American people are with them heart and soul.

It is to help relieve frightful conditions like that that this measure is presented. Until within the last 10 years national banks were not inhibited from contributing to any cause. The reason why we have a statute on the subject is that some banks inaugurated the reprehensible practice of contributing to party campaign funds, which did not appeal to the sense of propriety or the spirit of American fair play. The situation now is that some of the States, notably New York, Massachusetts, and other large States, have passed laws permitting State banks and trust companies to contribute to Red Cross funds. Other States do not prohibit benevolent contributions by corporations.

National banks, because of the circumstances I have cited, are expressly prohibited from making contributions. That law is

founded on good sense and was prompted by a just spirit. Ordinarily I would not be in favor of its modification in any particular. But now there is justification of the proposal. The Red Cross is not only nonsectarian, but is a quasi governmental institution. It has for its president the President of the United States. It has on its board of governors a representative from the State, War, and Navy Departments and from the Treasury and the Department of Justice. Its funds are expended under the strictest scrutiny of representatives of the United States Government, and I think I may confidently appeal to the spirit of this House and to its desire to aid any institution which is an essential and an indispensable part of the effort to win this war to suspend the rules and vote for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 14 minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that the Red Cross fund can not be raised without this assistance?

Mr. GLASS. I have been assured by officials of the Red Cross that the passage of this bill will, in their judgment, mean as much as \$5,000,000 to the total of the fund that will be raised.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does that mean that contributions to the amount of \$5,000,000 will be enforced from the persons who otherwise would not contribute?

Mr. GLASS. I do not think contributions will be "enforced," since this is a permissive proposition. If the stockholders do not desire the directors of banks to make the contribution, they have it in their power to prevent the contribution.

Mr. GORDON. How would they prevent it?

Mr. GLASS. By prohibiting the board of directors from making it.

Mr. GORDON. How can a minority stockholder prevent the directors from making the contribution?

Mr. GLASS. A minority stockholder could not. A minority stockholder in this, as in all matters covering banking business, would have to submit to the majority.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is meant by this language in the bill, pages 1 and 2:

Each association shall report to the Comptroller of the Currency within 10 days after the making of any such contribution the amount of such contribution and the amount of net earnings in excess of such contribution. Such report shall be attested by the president or cashier of the association in like manner as the report of the declaration of any dividend.

Mr. GLASS. That means additional Government scrutiny, that is all. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. So the Comptroller of the Currency is going to direct the contributions of the banks. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 20 minutes I am entitled to to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. DALE], a member of the committee.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no Member within the sound of my voice who does not desire to do everything that can be properly done to carry on this war. In the first place we can by law tax without limit; we can tax corporations, national banks, State banks, trust companies, and all corporations, State and National, without limit. It is a political power that we can use. Now, I would cheerfully vote at this time, or at any future time, to support the Red Cross by direct contributions or appropriations from the Treasury, and that would cover 110,000,000 of people to fill the Treasury of the United States.

I know it is not a gracious thing; it is not a thing that I care to do, get up and oppose this bill without full consideration. But let us analyze it a little bit. I have had recourse to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency. The number of shareholders in national banks is 459,610. That was the number in the last report that was made. Of those there are 138,204 women. I call your attention to the fact that there are many small and large stockholders across the water in the United States Army on the other side.

The national banks have a capital of something over \$1,000,000,000. The State banks have a larger capital than have the national banks. I mean the State banks, trust companies, and loan companies. This legislation does not touch them. The gentleman from Virginia says that some of the States have authorized such contributions.

Now, what does this bill do. The national banks are scattered all over the country, but the great banks are in the cities. There are some shares of stock in cities held by individuals in other cities and elsewhere in the United States.

I want to say that the five directors on the average in the country banks own a very small minority of the stock. They are selected because they are generally men of influence in the little town or city, and they come in contact with people, and are supposed to know how to run a bank.

The gentleman from Virginia said it was not prohibited to make contributions for political purposes or church purposes before the amendment to the law.

Mr. GLASS. I did not catch what the gentleman said.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Virginia said it was not prohibited prior to the amendment of the national banking act to make contributions for political purposes or for other purposes if they saw fit. Now, while that is true, they were not prohibited by express law; there never was a contribution made for political purposes by a national bank or for religious purposes but what the people who paid the money could be compelled to pay it back, because it was illegal all the time.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Does the gentleman limit it to national banks? Is not that true with reference to State banks?

Mr. CANNON. I understand it is true. It is true in the State of Illinois. But there are a great many stockholders, nearly half a million in the national banks alone—widows, small trust funds, scattered here and there, farmers, little shopkeepers—and, of course, they did not do much suing to recover the amounts that were illegally given for political, religious, or other purposes not connected with the bank; they did not want to go through the litigation, and, perhaps, go to the Supreme Court of the United States. It became a scandal, and it was from a political standpoint very largely that that scandal was cut out by the roots. I just want to add this: Take it to yourselves, take your little banks, your farmers, representing what is called substantial rural parts of the country—

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman, out of the length of his years of service and wisdom, says that this was a great scandal. Would he mind stating in what campaign the greatest scandal—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I do not recollect what it was, and I do not care. If it was the gentleman's party, his party participated, and if it was my party, the criticism would apply just the same. Let me say to the gentleman that is a little peanuty. [Laughter.] I want to see to it that the widow, the small trust fund, the small fellow, can not be legally deprived of his property by putting it into the power of a board of directors, owning themselves less than the majority of the stock, to spend his property, without his consent.

Mr. GORDON. Or give it away.

Mr. CANNON. Or give it away. When I have stated that I think I have stated substantially the whole thing. I might talk an hour about it, but I wanted to put it to you. If you want money, why do not you let Ford, with his great holdings in banks, as I am told; why do not you let Rockefeller and his great holdings in banks and in corporations; why do not you let the great holdings in the United States Steel be contributed by authorizing the board of directors in these great corporations throughout the United States, with their ten—yes; twenty and thirty—billions of dollars, contribute from their earnings? All of the great holdings and the small holdings in corporations, States or United States, can be reached by law to get revenue for the Treasury of the United States to carry on the war, including the support of the Red Cross.

Mr. GLASS. Because Congress has no authority, I may say, to authorize them, but as a matter of fact they have made these contributions, and Mr. Justice Hughes and Judge Morgan J. O'Brien said they are perfectly legal.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, Mr. Justice Hughes—and who is the other gentleman?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Justice Hughes is sufficient.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know whether Mr. Justice Hughes said it or not. He never said it on the bench. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. Does the gentleman mean to intimate that Mr. Justice Hughes said one thing on the bench and another off it?

Mr. CANNON. I am neither defending nor attacking Mr. ex-Judge Hughes, but I say it is not fair to let five directors in a little bank or in a considerable bank, with all of the national banks having a half million stockholders—it is not fair to say that those directors can use the money that belongs to the trust fund, to the widows, and contribute it to any purpose. I believe in protecting the smaller holder.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Give me half a minute more.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. One minute more. I understand we are to have a revenue bill yet this session, and if this contribution is not made freely in the United States up to \$100,000,000 or to \$200,000,000, or any other sum, for the Red Cross, that it needs in performing its function during this war, then I stand ready to vote the money directly from the Treasury. Having said this much, I shall resume my seat, because my time is up. [Applause.]

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, patriotic? Yes. No more patriotic work is done by any people in all the world than is done by the Red Cross; but why not let the individual citizens of America contribute to the funds of the Red Cross? Why not let the men and women of America, who are willing to contribute, contribute their own funds? Why authorize the national banks of America to contribute the funds of the individuals who own these banks? Why should the Comptroller of the Currency require a report of contributions by national banks to the Red Cross? I do not hold myself responsible for the statement, but I understand that the Comptroller of the Currency requested the national banks of America to contribute to the Red Cross fund, and that many of these banks refused because they were not permitted to do so under the law, and now a law is proposed, coming from the Comptroller of the Currency, to require the banks to do the thing which they refused to do on his request. Every patriotic American is proud if he is able to contribute to the Red Cross fund. Then, why take the right away from him and hand it over to a board of directors who are elected to manage his business? Do you want to give the individual stockholders of the banks an opportunity to say that they have already contributed through their banks and therefore ought not to be called upon for further contributions? That is what this law will do. Instead of increasing the contributions to the Red Cross, the enactment of this law will prevent contributions to the fund, because it will give to every man who is a stockholder in a national bank the excuse that his bank has already made the contribution. [Applause.] I am willing to contribute to the Red Cross fund every time I can, but I do not want to give the powers to the directors of the banks in which I am interested to contribute of the funds that belong to me in their banks. You are making a mistake. You have no right to give Government sanction to a thing of that sort, and you are doing harm instead of good and preventing the collection of a large fund for a patriotic work by preventing patriotic citizens from doing the thing which they want to do and which you by this legislation prevent them from doing.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time. All I have to say is that this legislation is uncalled for, unjustified by the facts. Everybody in America is glad to help the Red Cross. Why not give them the opportunity; why not depend upon their patriotic fervor to make the contributions which the Red Cross needs? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am not arguing against the collection of money to aid the Red Cross, but for the Congress of the United States to attempt to authorize the directors of a corporation to give other people's money away is bad legislation. [Applause.] There is no occasion for it; there is no justification for it. No matter whether this bill becomes a law or not, as a director in a national bank I would not vote away the stockholders' money without being authorized by every stockholder of that bank. I do not think any other man has any justification in voting other people's money away. If you by legislation can authorize the directors of a national bank to vote away the fund of that bank by donation, you can give authority to any set of directors representing any corporate organization of this country. The Federal Government has no control over the funds of a national bank further than to see to it that the funds of that bank are used to protect the depositors in that bank. That is all the authority the Federal Government has over those things.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, briefly; I have only three minutes.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I will be brief. I want to state how my city has paid its quota by the citizens voluntarily organizing a war-chest fund, where 95,000 people subscribed \$3,000,000

in five days, and the day we got the report of what the quota was we sent a check in full. I propose to present our plan to the House at the first opportunity—

Mr. FORDNEY. That is too long a question; I have only three minutes, and I could not answer that in my time. But let me tell you, I am ready to give my share to the aid of the Red Cross. I have been aiding it, and I will continue to do so, but I do not want you to authorize a board of directors to give my money away without my consent. Another matter, whether you pass this law or not, if you do pass this law I firmly believe—I am not a lawyer, but that, to me, is but horse sense—that any stockholder in a bank could restrain by injunction the directors of the bank from giving away their money. Why, it is the biggest piece of folly, in my opinion, that has been presented to the Congress of the United States. Nobody refuses to give to the Red Cross who can afford it, but, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] well said, if you pass this law, and a national bank does subscribe to the Red Cross fund, you have given the stockholders an argument to say, "I have given through a national bank, I am a stockholder, and I will give no more." I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has only two minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to relieve from criminal responsibility directors in national banks who give away the funds of the bank. It does not, in my judgment, legally authorize the directors to do that thing. It is proposed to authorize these bank directors to levy upon unwilling men, or upon men who have already donated toward a very worthy purpose all the money they feel they are able to donate, to coerce and compel them to pay more. It is either that or it is nothing. In legal effect it does relieve the directors from Federal prosecution under the law which was passed some years ago by Congress making it a crime for men in the capacity of directors to give away the funds of the stockholders for whom they are trustees. I wholly disagree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] in his statement that every banking corporation or any other private corporation can give to any purpose, however worthy, the funds of the stockholders. It is an ultra vires act; it is unlawful; and the money so donated can be recovered back by a private suit of an objecting stockholder. The fact that he can not afford to bring that suit, because he would be penalized in expenses for lawyers' fees a great deal more than his share of the enforced contribution, will illustrate the injustice of such a statute as this. Widows and orphans who have stock in these banking corporations can be forced by the directors to contribute. Imbeciles, idiots, and lunatics who are under guardianship where the guardian is the holder in trust of stock that came by gift or descent, perhaps, to his wards are forced to contribute, and that guardian would be subject to removal and his accounts would be corrected and his bond held liable if he made a donation of his ward's funds for any purpose, however worthy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I do not believe anybody is more interested in the Red Cross than I am. I was one of the original incorporators of that corporation. I have been one ever since. I am always eager, as every man here is, to do everything we can for the magnificent work it is accomplishing; but, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to see the great popularity of that superb organization used to break down one of the most wholesome principles which has been established in recent years in the United States. [Applause.]

I think one of the healthiest growths in the public conscience of recent years has been that the directors of corporations are trustees and that they have no right to give away their stockholders' money; and I am unwilling, even for such a splendid purpose as this, that the bank directors should be given the right to give away money which does not belong to them, and that they should have the glory and the credit of a generosity which belongs to their stockholders.

The gentleman says that certain States have authorized such acts. My State of Massachusetts has authorized corporations to give away funds for war purposes. But the bill provides that any stockholder can, by writing, express his opposition to such an act, and then it shall not apply to him. That preserves the rights of individuals. Why not insert such a provision

here? But for Congress to come forward and suddenly contradict the policy which has been settled and growing among the people for so many years, and use the glorious work of the Red Cross to excuse it, is, I think, a mistaken and an injurious policy. Let us vote the money directly from the Treasury, if it is necessary as a war measure, but let us not permit officers of corporations to give away what does not belong to them. It is very hard to vote against such a bill. The fear of being accused of lukewarmness toward the Red Cross will compel many to vote for it who thoroughly disapprove the principle. Disagreeable as the duty is, I shall not shirk it.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought not to say so, but I take leave to observe that no reason has been presented in the discussion that has at all altered my view of the proposition. I have no doubt the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] is a sound constitutional lawyer. Certainly he knows better than I, who am not a lawyer at all, whether it is "criminal" or wise to pass this bill; but I have, within the past two days, read an exceedingly well-considered opinion by former Justice Hughes on the subject, and likewise a clear, cogent argument by Judge Morgan J. O'Brien, of the Supreme Court of New York State, and I venture, at least, to agree with them in the belief that it would be legal, if Congress shall pass an act to make it so, for national banks, as it is now for corporations generally, to aid an essential enterprise in a great war which has put at stake the Nation's very existence. It is not as if we were permitting banks to contribute their funds merely to "a worthy cause," but to an indispensable arm of the military service, potentially effective as a part of the scheme to win a war that involves the life of these very corporations and the value of their property.

I have in the files of the Banking and Currency Committee, received within the last 10 days, scores of letters from national and State banks protesting against the proposition to insure, in a limited way, the deposits of those who put money in the banks. I have letters from hundreds of State banks and trust companies protesting against the so-called Phelan bill, which this House has passed, giving national banks fiduciary powers and trust functions, but I have not in the files of the committee a single protest from a single stockholder in a single national bank in the United States against this proposition to permit national banks to contribute to the Red Cross fund. That is, as it seems to me, conclusive as to the feeling on the subject.

Mr. GORDON. Maybe they have contributed all they are able to.

Mr. GLASS. Maybe they are like some others who have contributed individually, but are willing to contribute collectively, also. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said that he had contributed already and was willing to contribute all that he could, but protested against the contribution of banks in which he has an interest.

May I be permitted to say that I have contributed not all I can contribute, perhaps; I doubt if any of us ever contribute all we really can. But I am willing for the banks in which I am interested to contribute every farthing of my profits in them to the Red Cross fund, or any other fund that seems essential to win this war. And if the stockholders or the widows and orphans or imbeciles have not protested—

Mr. GORDON. They could not. They are under guardianship.

Mr. GLASS. Why should gentlemen here protest for them?

Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross for the effective purposes of this war is an essential institution. It ought to be supported in every conceivable way. The banks, and I say it confidently, because there has been no protest from any banking source, are willing to do this thing, and Congress, therefore, should not object to its being done. The only bank officials, the only bank stockholders, that I know anything of, who have protested, have been the gentlemen who have spoken against the bill here to-day.

Mr. GORDON. I will say to the gentleman that I am not a stockholder in any national bank. I do not own a cent of stock.

Mr. GLASS. Well, I am; and I am willing that every dollar of my profits should be appropriated to the Red Cross, if it is essential, aside from my individual subscription. When men are giving their sons to fight and, perhaps, die for their country, it seems to me unfortunate that gentlemen should get up here and protest against a bank being permitted to make a contribution to the Red Cross.

I hope it will be the judgment of this body, as it was of the other body, that banks, for the period of the war, shall be authorized, if they please to do so—because there is no compulsion about it—to subscribe to this fund out of the profits of the institutions. And then if there is any stockholder who wants to

split hairs, or whose greed or penchant for technical dispute shall lead him to protest, let him go to the officers of the bank—

Mr. PURNELL. Does the gentleman believe the success of the Red Cross drive depends upon contributions from these banks?

Mr. GLASS. I have stated to the House that officials of the Red Cross Society have said to me that the passage of this bill to-day involves, in their judgment, \$5,000,000 to the general fund of the Red Cross.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

Mr. MEEKER. He does not mean to say that the people will not put up the \$5,000,000 if it is not procured in this way?

Mr. GLASS. I have said that there will possibly be a difference of \$5,000,000 in the funds of the Red Cross if this bill does not pass. The American people are generous. The stockholders of the national banks are generous. I do not believe you could get 3 per cent of them to petition Congress not to pass this bill.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. Why would not the gentleman then put in an amendment such as was put in the Massachusetts statute, saying that if the stockholder objects his money shall not be given away by the directors?

Mr. GLASS. If there is any stockholder of a bank who is close-fisted enough to object to the paltry contribution which his percentage would represent, when the majority of the stockholders feel it is essential to make the contribution, I would not take the trouble to relieve that fellow by law.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But suppose the share of stock held by this fellow you had the slight opinion of was that of a poor woman, and that it was her only estate in life?

Mr. GLASS. What would be the percentage of any poor woman who owned \$100 in a national bank? It would be 10 cents.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is not a question of percentage. It is a question of principle. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. It is "a question of principle" that never was put into statutory law until 40 years after national banks were established, and only then because of scandalous abuses by politicians on banking boards. It was not such a great "principle" during that long period as to be regarded with deep concern or apprehension, and all this talk about "widows and orphans" is to prop a lame case. A widow with \$100 in a national bank would have to pay about 10 cents, and she would pay it, too, with as much cheerfulness as some of the gentlemen who are protesting in behalf of the widows. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the judgment of the Chair—

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands a roll call. Those who desire a roll call on this bill will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number have risen. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 70, answered "present" 2, not voting 164, as follows:

YEAS—194.

Alexander	Candler, Miss.	Fairchild, D. L.	Hull, Tenn.
Almon	Carlin	Ferris	Igoe
Anderson	Classon	Fields	Ireland
Aswell	Cleary	Fisher	Johnson, Ky.
Austin	Collier	Francis	Jones
Ayres	Connally, Tex.	Frear	Juul
Baer	Cooper, Ohio	French	Keating
Bankhead	Cooper, W. Va.	Gandy	Kennedy, Iowa
Barkley	Cox	Garrett, Tex.	Kennedy, R. I.
Barnhart	Cramton	Glass	Kincheloc
Beakes	Crisp	Goodwin, Ark.	King
Bell	Dallinger	Graham, Ill.	Kinkaid
Black	Decker	Gregg	Knudson
Blackmon	Delaney	Hadley	Larsen
Bland	Denison	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lazaro
Blanton	Denton	Hamlin	Lee, Cal.
Booher	Dickinson	Hardy	Lee, Ga.
Bowers	Dixon	Harrison, Miss.	Linthicum
Brand	Domineck	Harrison, Va.	Littlepage
Britten	Doolittle	Hastings	Lobeck
Brumbaugh	Doughton	London	Loneragan
Buchanan	Dowell	Hayden	Lunn
Burnett	Drane	Helm	McAndrews
Ryones, S. C.	Dupré	Helvering	McArthur
Ryons, Tenn.	Eagle	Hensley	McClintic
Caldwell	Emerson	Holland	McCulloch
Campbell, Kans.	Esch	Houston	

McKeown	Park	Siegel	Voigt
Magee	Peters	Sims	Waldow
Mansfield	Phelan	Sinnott	Walker
Martin	Platt	Snell	Walton
Mays	Quinn	Smith, Mich.	Watkins
Miller, Wash.	Ragsdale	Smith, C. B.	Watson, Va.
Moon	Rainey, H. T.	Steagall	Weaver
Morgan	Rainey, J. W.	Stedman	Welling
Mott	Ramsayer	Stephens, Miss.	Welty
Mudd	Randall	Stevenson	Whaley
Neely	Rayburn	Stiness	Wheeler
Nelson	Reed	Summers	White, Me.
Nicholls, S. C.	Roberts	Sweet	White, Ohio
Nichols, Mich.	Robinson	Switzer	Wilson, Tex.
Nolan	Romjue	Talbott	Wingo
Norton	Rubey	Taylor, Ark.	Woodyard
Oliver, Ala.	Russell	Taylor, Colo.	Wright
Oliver, N. Y.	Saunders, Va.	Thomas	Young, N. Dak.
Olney	Shackelford	Thompson	Young, Tex.
Osborne	Shallenberger	Tillman	Zihman
O'Shaunessy	Sherwood	Van Dyke	
Overstreet	Shouse	Vinson	

NAYS—70.

Anthony	Freeman	Lehibach	Slayden
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Lundeen	Slemp
Bacharach	Garner	McKenzie	Stafford
Borland	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sterling, Ill.
Browne	Gillet	McLemore	Temple
Browning	Glynn	Madden	Timberlake
Burroughs	Good	Mapes	Tinkham
Cannon	Goodall	Mecker	Towner
Dale, Vt.	Gordon	Moore, Ind.	Treadway
Dyer	Green, Iowa	Parker, N. J.	Vestal
Eagan	Greene, Mass.	Pou	Volstead
Elliot	Greene, Vt.	Purnell	Walsh
Ellsworth	Hersey	Raker	Ward
Easton	Hollingsworth	Reavis	Wason
Fairfield	Hutchinson	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Fess	Kitchin	Sanders, Ind.	Wood, Ind.
Fordney	Kraus	Schall	
Foss	La Follette	Scott, Iowa	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 2.

Chandler, Okla. Rodenberg

NOT VOTING—164.

Beshlin	Evans	Kehoe	Rose
Brodbeck	Fairchild, G. W.	Kelley, Mich.	Rouse
Butler	Farr	Kelly, Pa.	Rowe
Campbell, Pa.	Flood	Kettner	Rowland
Cantrill	Flynn	Key, Ohio	Rucker
Caraway	Focht	Kiess, Pa.	Sabath
Carew	Foster	Kreider	Sanders, La.
Carter, Mass.	Fuller, Ill.	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Carter, Okla.	Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Sanford
Cary	Gallivan	Leshner	Scott, Mich.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Lever	Scott, Pa.
Church	Garland	Little	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Godwin, N. C.	Longworth	Sears
Clark, Pa.	Goud	Lufkin	Sells
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	McCormick	Sherley
Coady	Gray, Ala.	McFadden	Sisson
Connely, Kans.	Gray, N. J.	McKinley	Sloan
Cooper, Wis.	Griest	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Idaho
Copley	Griffin	Maher	Smith, T. F.
Costello	Hamill	Mann	Snell
Crago	Hamilton, Mich.	Mason	Snook
Crosser	Haskell	Merritt	Snyder
Currie, Mich.	Haugen	Miller, Minn.	Steele
Curry, Cal.	Hayes	Mondell	Steenerson
Dale, N. Y.	Heaton	Montague	Stephens, Nebr.
Darrow	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Pa.
Davidson	Heintz	Morin	Strong
Davis	Hicks	Oldfield	Sullivan
Dempsey	Hilliard	Overmyer	Swift
Dent	Hood	Padgett	Tague
Dewalt	Howard	Paige	Templeton
Dies	Huddleston	Parker, N. Y.	Tilson
Dill	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Vare
Dillon	Humphreys	Porter	Venable
Donovan	Husted	Powers	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Jacoway	Pratt	Webb
Doremus	James	Price	Williams
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ramsey	Wilson, La.
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	Rankin	Wirslow
Edmonds	Kahn	Riordan	Wise
Estopinal	Kearns	Robbins	Woods, Iowa

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. PRICE with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROSE.

Mr. COADY with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.
 Mr. DILL with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
 Mr. HILLIARD with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. BESHLIN with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CROSSER with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. STEENEBSON.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. COPLEY.
 Mr. VENABLE with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. DARROW.
 Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. CRAIG.
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. DILLON.
 Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. DEMPSEY.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. FOCHT.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. FLOOD with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. PADGETT with Miss RANKIN.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ROBBINS.
 Mr. GARD with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. POLK with Mr. SCOTT of Michigan.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. SISSON with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. HUDDLESTON with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. KEARNS.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. LESHER with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. LUKIN.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. MEERITT.
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 On the vote:
 Mr. HEFLIN (for) with Mr. SANFORD (against).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4193. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4194. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3935. An act to prohibit the sale, manufacture, and importation of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Hawaii during the period of the war, except as hereinafter provided.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, the following Members were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD: Mr. GLASS, Mr. CALDWELL, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. BELL, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SIEGEL, and Mr. GORDON.

THE JOURNAL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move to correct the Journal of Saturday's proceedings on page 6742 by striking out the language and inserting other language which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moved that, notwithstanding the disagreement of the House to all Senate amendments, the conferees be instructed to urge the elimination of the following language from the amendment of the Senate No. 52: "the annual salaries fixed by law for clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, railway postal clerks of grade 1 to grade 10, inclusive, shall be increased \$200 per annum"; and to insist upon the insertion in lieu thereof of the following language:

"That clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service who are in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, under the act of March 2, 1907, as amended, shall pass automatically from such grades and the salaries they receive thereunder to the new grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, with the salaries provided for such grades in this act.

"That the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100, grade 2 at \$1,200, grade 3 at \$1,300, grade 4 at \$1,400, grade 5 at \$1,500, grade 6 at \$1,600, grade 7 at \$1,700, grade 8 at \$1,800, grade 9 at \$1,900, grade 10 at \$2,000.

"The Postmaster General shall classify and fix salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and of establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows:

"Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,400; class B, \$1,100 to \$1,500; and Class C, \$1,100 to \$1,700. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary, and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices: *Provided*, That railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade, with salaries provided for in this act."

during their consideration of said Senate amendment No. 52, to all of which the House disagreed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on making the correction as stated.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings as amended was approved.

On motion of Mr. GLASS, the bill (H. R. 9457) authorizing national banks to make contributions to the American National Red Cross was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 21, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission submitting estimate of appropriation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Sterling Basin, at Greenport, N. Y., with a view to securing adequate width and depth (H. Doc. No. 1114); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 3799) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 579), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 12190) to punish mob violence directed against persons charged with violation of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12191) to provide for free carriage of first-class mail matter to and from persons in the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12192) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12193) to punish and fix the penalty for high crimes, offenses, and misdemeanors against the welfare, safety, and dignity of the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 12194) to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PLATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 293) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 353) for the consideration of H. R. 12099; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 354) for the consideration of H. R. 12100; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 12195) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12196) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 12197) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Scherr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12198) granting an increase of pension to William P. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 12199) granting a pension to Mary J. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12200) granting an increase of pension to John Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 12201) granting a pension to Lucy A. Gardner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12202) granting an increase of pension to David Hofer, alias John Burkhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12203) granting a pension to Loretah B. Farlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12204) granting a pension to Kate A. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12205) granting a pension to Mary E. Beall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 12206) granting a pension to David Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12207) for the relief of James F. Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12208) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of the churches of Plymouth Rock Association, pledging loyalty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of W. M. Duff and 37 others, all of Denver, Colo., urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of the Presbyterian Church of Northville, Mich., in favor of repeal of postal zone system of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Ladies' Round Table Club, of Pontiac, Mich., in favor of repeal of postal zone system of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of residents of Beltrami County, Minn., favoring fixing the prices of wheat substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Clearing House Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4426; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Rev. J. M. Sundheim, president of the northern Minnesota district, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 5712; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the proposed postal increases for publishers effective July 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the El Paso County (Colo.) Retail Grocers' and Butchers' Association, asking that prices on wheat substitutes be fixed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 21, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bless Thee that in all the long and weary and tragic months through which we have come, as we have pressed forward in the performance of our high mission, we have had no question about the pureness of Thy motive, the unselfishness of our design, and the full and free committal of ourselves to the rights of men. We believe that Thou hast been leading us on. We pray that Thou wilt continue to lead us. Bless those who represent us on the bloody field of battle, and those who guide in the affairs of nations, and those who are delivering their strength of means and life to the great end of establishing peace and righteousness among men. Bless us this day in the performance of our duty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, May 17, 1918, was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 2123. An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia;

S. 4409. An act to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes";

H. R. 8696. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; and

H. R. 11628. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a few days ago I received and had read into the RECORD an editorial from a newspaper in a neighboring State to that of South Dakota relative to the subscriptions of the State for the third liberty loan. I now send to the desk a telegram with reference to the subscriptions to the second Red Cross war fund, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK., May 20, 1918.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.:
With every city, village, and township under perfect organization, drive for second Red Cross war fund was begun this morning at 8 o'clock in every community in South Dakota. At 6 o'clock to-night the State campaign is concluded with a subscription of 170 per cent of our allotment. Our home county (Minnehaha) wins the honor with more than 300 per cent subscription of its allotment. South Dakota is the first State to go over the top.

GEO. R. DOUTHITT,
Vice Chairman for South Dakota.